

ARCHIVES OF MARYLAND

Edited by J. HALL PLEASANTS, M. D.

Published by authority of the State

VOLUME XLVI (Assembly Series, Volume 22)

PROCEEDINGS AND ACTS OF THE ASSEMBLY, 1748-51.

This volume of the archives is now ready for distribution. The attention of members of the Society who do not now receive the Archives is called to the liberal provision made by the Legislature, which permits the Society to furnish to its own members copies of the volumes, as they are published from year to year, at the mere cost of paper, presswork, and binding. This cost is at present fixed at one dollar, at which price members of the Society may obtain one copy of each volume published. For additional copies, a price of three dollars is charged.

The European background upon which American affairs were projected when the Assembly met in session in 1748, found Great Britain still engaged with France in what in the colonies was called King George's War, but when the Assembly met in 1749, Governor Ogle was able to congratulate the province upon the restoration of peace, which had been effected by the recently signed treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.

Samuel Ogle, who had entered upon his third term as Governor in 1746, continued to serve in that capacity during the period covered by this volume, and died in office, May 3rd, 1752. He was an excellent governor, and the controversies which took place between him and the members of the Lower House, who were of the Country, or anti-Proprietary party, at the time usually in a slight majority in this body, were due rather to the rising spirit of independence then developing in the colonies, than to any feeling of ill will towards the Governor himself, who was tactful and personally popular. As the General Assembly did not meet in 1752 until after Ogle's death, this volume completes the story of the activities of the Assembly during his last administration. The Country party was continually at loggerheads with the Proprietary party as represented by the Governor, the Upper House and the followers of the Proprietary in the Lower House, usually in the minority here. Charles, the fifth Lord Baltimore, died, April 24th, 1751, and his son Frederick, the sixth and last Lord, then a minor, became Proprietary. With Frederick's delinquencies later volumes will deal.

BENEFACTORS AND CONTRIBUTORS TO THE FUNDS OF THE SOCIETY

Mrs. Mary Washington Keyser, Gift of the Buildings and grounds of the Society (1916).	
George Peabody, Gift (1866).....	\$20,000.00
J. Wilson Leakin, Bequest (1923), Historical relics and.....	10,000.00
Drayton Meade Hite, Gift (1919)	1,000.00
and Bequest (1923).....	6,000.00
Mrs. Drayton Meade Hite, Bequest (1927).....	4,000.00
Mendes Cohen, Bequest (1915).....	5,000.00
Mrs. Caroline J. Lytle (1928).....	5,000.00
Van Lear Black, Gift.....	1,500.00
Miss Eleanor S. Cohen, Gifts (1919 Historical relics and \$300, Memorial to her parents, Israel and Cecilia E. Cohen (1926)	1,000.00
Miss Susan Dobbin Leakin 1924), Preparation of J. Wilson Leakin room and contribution to its contents.	
Charles Exley Calvert, Gift.....	1,150.00
Mrs. Thomas B. Gresham, Bequest (1926)	1,200.00
Isaac Henry Ford, Bequest (1916).....	1,000.00
W. Hall Harris, Gift.....	1,000.00
Isaac F. Nicholson, Gift (1909).....	1,000.00
Isaac Tyson Norris, Gift (1916).....	1,000.00
J. Henry Stickney, Bequest (1892).....	1,000.00
Mrs. Emilie McKim Reed, Bequest (1926).....	1,000.00
Henry Stockbridge, Gift (1920).....	1,000.00
DeCourcy W. Thom, Gift.....	1,000.00
Mrs. DeCourcy W. Thom, Gift.....	1,000.00
W. G. Baker, Gift.....	500.00
Mrs. W. Hall Harris, Gift.....	500.00
Adelaide S. Wilson, Gift.....	500.00
J. Appleton Wilson, Gift.....	500.00
William Power Wilson, Gift.....	500.00
Mrs. Rebecca Lanier King, Bequest (1928).....	500.00
McHenry Howard, Gift.....	333.34
Charles McHenry Howard, Gift.....	333.33
Elizabeth Gray Howard, Gift.....	333.33
Simon Dalsheimer, Gift.....	300.00
Miles White, Jr., Gift.....	300.00

Miss Nellie Williams, Gift.....	\$ 200.00
Charles C. Homer, Jr., Gift	150.00
Raphael Semmes, Gifts.....	140.00
Mrs. George F. Libby, Gifts.....	125.00
Samuel M. Wilson, Gift.....	120.00
Louis H. Dielman, Gift.....	100.00
R. C. Hoffman, Gift.....	100.00
Henry P. Hynson, Gift.....	100.00
William Ingle, Gift.....	100.00
Mrs. Rebecca Littlejohn, Gift.....	100.00
John H. Morgan, Gift.....	100.00
Lawrence J. Morris, Life Membership.....	100.00
Mrs. Charlotte Gilman Paul, Gift.....	100.00
Mrs. Mary B. Redwood, Life Membership.....	100.00
Bernard C. Steiner, Gift.....	100.00
Edwin Warfield, Jr., Gift.....	75.00
Mrs. Emma U. Warfield, Gift.....	75.00
Blanchard Randall, Gift.....	43.42
Ferd. Bernheimer, Gift.....	30.00
Walter I. Dawkins, Gift.....	25.00
William J. Donnelly, Gift.....	25.00
A. E. Duncan, Gift.....	25.00
Mrs. E. Edmunds Foster, Gift.....	25.00
John W. Marshall, Gift.....	25.00
John Parker, Gift.....	25.00
Daniel Annan, Gift.....	20.00
C. C. Shriver, Gift.....	20.00
Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Gift.....	16.00
Mrs. John H. Sherburne, Gift.....	10.00
Mrs. Annie Leakin Sioussat, Gift.....	10.00
Samuel Grafton Duvall, Gift.....	10.00
William B. Levy, Gift.....	5.00
Philip Francis Trippe, Gift.....	5.00

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

INCORPORATED 1843.

H. IRVINE KEYSER MEMORIAL BUILDING,
201 W. MONUMENT STREET,
BALTIMORE.

OFFICERS.

President,
W. HALL HARRIS.

Vice-Presidents,
DECOURCY W. THOM, CLINTON L. RIGGS,
RICHARD M. DUVALL.

Corresponding Secretary, *Recording Secretary,*
JAMES E. HANCOCK. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.

Treasurer,
HEYWARD E. BOYCE.

THE COUNCIL.

THE GENERAL OFFICERS

AND REPRESENTATIVES OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

JESSE N. BOWEN,	Representing the Trustees of the Athenaeum.
J. HALL PLEASANTS,	" Committee on Publication.
HENRY J. BERKLEY, M. D.,	" Committee on the Library.
WILLIAM INGLE,	" Committee on Finance.
JAMES D. IGLEHART,	" Committee on Membership.
LAURENCE H. FOWLER,	" Committee on the Gallery.
JOHN L. SANFORD,	" Committee on Addresses.
WILLIAM B. MARYE,	" Committee on Genealogy.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
BELLEVUE: THE HOME OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF COLONIAL DAMES. <i>By Mrs. Joseph Rucker Lamar,</i>	99
THE FIRST MAN UP SAN JUAN HILL. <i>By DeCourcy W. Thom,</i>	112
CHARLES CALVERT (1663-1733) AND SOME OF HIS DESCENDANTS. <i>By John Bailey Calvert Nicklin,</i>	126
MARYLAND RENT ROLLS,	132
JOHN HENRY ALEXANDER, LL. D., FIRST GEOLOGIST OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND. <i>By Henry J. Berkley,</i>	145
EARLIEST RECORDS OF BALTIMORE COUNTY. <i>Contributed by Louis Dow Scisco,</i>	151
ABORIGINAL MARYLAND, 1608-1689. Part I. <i>By Raphael Semmes, LL. B., PH. D.,</i>	157
MARSHALL HALL BURYING GROUND AT MARSHALL HALL, MD.,	172
"FORT FREDERICK": ITS OWNERSHIP, AND HOW TITLE WAS TWICE ACQUIRED BY MARYLAND. <i>By W. McCulloh Brown,</i>	176
EXTRACTS FROM ACCOUNT AND LETTER BOOKS OF DR. CHARLES CARROLL, OF ANNAPOLIS,	181
PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY,	193

Committee on Publications

SAMUEL K. DENNIS, *Chairman*

JOHN M. VINCENT,

J. HALL PLEASANTS.

LOUIS H. DIELMAN,

Editor.

MARYLAND

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

Vol. XXIV.

JUNE, 1929.

No. 2.

BELLEVUE: THE HOME OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF COLONIAL DAMES.

By Mrs. JOSEPH RUCKER LAMAR.

Among the often reiterated objects of our National Society is the restoration and preservation of old, colonial houses, and in nothing have we done better or more important work. Throughout our colonial territory, in each of the thirteen colonial States, there is some interesting house, dating from colonial times, which our Society preserves and cares for, opening it to the public and allowing it to tell its story to the American people.

There is, however, one striking exception to this custom, and strange to say, it is in the place where, of all others, we would most expect to see such an historical link with the past—the one spot where such a house would attract the widest attention and make the most profound appeal to our people; I mean in Washington, the Capital of the United States. It is not so in the capitals of other countries. It is impossible to visit London without being reminded, at every turn, of the history of England. But Washington is an unwritten page in this respect. Except for Georgetown, it is all new. There is nothing in it that goes back of the year 1800, when our Government was moved from the banks of the Schuylkill to the banks of the Potomac; and our Society,—so sensible of its duty to Virginia and Massachusetts,

—has done nothing for the preservation of the colonial history of our Capital.

The Executive Committee of the National Society met and approved the recommendation of the Headquarters Committee, that we should purchase, if possible, the house known as Bellevue, in Georgetown in the District of Columbia.

The question naturally arises: have we any proof that Bellevue is colonial, and that it fulfils our requirements? My answer, after more than a year's investigation, is emphatically: Yes. I have satisfied myself, and I expect to convince you, that it was built by George Beall, who died in 1780, during the Revolutionary war, and that he built it, probably, before the town of Georgetown was laid out, in 1751.

The neighborhood of Georgetown was settled in the latter part of the seventeenth century; and as early as 1703—according to Taggart,—there was a landing called Sawpit Landing which was an important trading post on the Georgetown side of Rock Creek, where it empties into the Potomac. In Maryland and Virginia, in colonial times, tobacco was the sole crop which was cultivated for revenue. There were, practically no roads at that time in that neighborhood, but the shores of the Potomac, as of other rivers in Virginia and Maryland, were threaded with streams which were often navigable for a mile or more inland, and the tobacco planters used them as highways. The tobacco was cut and cured on the plantation and packed into hogsheads; a kind of axle was fastened to either end and the casks were trundled, by horses, along the country trails to the nearest landing. Here there was usually an Inspection house where the tobacco was weighed, inspected, and loaded on ships bound for England.

There was probably an Inspection house at Sawpit Landing on Rock Creek in 1703; and in that year, Ninian Beall, who owned many plantations, patented a tract of about 795 acres, which he called "The Rock of Dumbarton"—a name which clings to the land to the present day. It ran along the western bank of Rock Creek and included a large part of Georgetown—now Washington City—as well as the lovely Rock Creek Park.

Ninian Beall was born in Scotland in 1625 and emigrated to America where he distinguished himself as a Burgess, as Commander-in-Chief of the Maryland forces and as a successful defender of the colony from the attacks of the Indians; so that in 1699, the Maryland Assembly passed an "Act of Gratitude" to him, for his services to the colony. These facts have been cut on a stone boulder in old Saint John's Church yard, by the Sons of Colonial Wars.

Ninian was 78 years old when he patented this land, and he died in 1717, at the age of 92. His descendants are scattered all over the United States. He had children and grand-children living near him at the time of his death, to whom he left numerous plantations, bearing the quaint names which were customary at that time:—"Sam's Beginning," "Good Luck," and "The Recovery." "The Recovery" was incorporated as a part of Georgetown in 1784. Ninian did not mention any houses in his will, he bequeathed the plantations by name, and the houses went with the land. He left the "tract of land called the Rock of Dumbarton, lying and being at Rock Creek and containing 480 acres," to his youngest son, George Beall. This son, whom we will call George Beall, 1st, was born in 1695 and was 22 years old when his father died. He is said to have been the first settler in Georgetown; but, as we shall see, he did not live in what was then Georgetown,—which was on the Potomac, in Frederick County,—but he lived nearby, on Rock Creek, in what was later Montgomery County,¹ as is stated in a Maryland ordinance relating to his property. He owned a large part of the land on which Georgetown was built, however, and in 1751, (48 years after Ninian patented the land) the Maryland Assembly ordered that a town should be laid out in Frederick County,² on the Potomac, above the mouth of Rock Creek, adjacent to the Inspection house of the County; and that for this purpose, sixty

¹ The boundaries of the Counties have been changed since that date. At first it was all Prince George County, then Frederick was formed and later Montgomery.

² *Ibid.*

acres of land should be bought from George Beall and George Gordon. Gordon and Beall refused to sell, and the Commissioners condemned sixty acres of their joint land, which they appraised at £280. The land was divided into 80 lots and sixty-nine of them sold within a year. Beall and Gordon were each offered his choice of two lots and though Beall at first indignantly refused them, he ultimately chose two lots known as Henderson's and Edmonston's. Had he lived within the limits of the town he would have chosen his own lot.

Rock Creek was a larger stream at that time than it is today—as appears from a map of Georgetown made in 1751—and was navigable for some distance inland.³ Sawpit Landing was probably near what is now M Street. K Street, where it crosses the Creek, was then under water.⁴ The Frederick County Inspection house, round which Georgetown grew, was on Gordon's land,⁵ on the Potomac, west of where Wisconsin Avenue touched the river.

George Beall lived a long and honorable life, serving his country, as his father had before him, and died in 1780. He left a part of the Rock of Dumbarton to his youngest son, Thomas Beall. It was divided by the first large branch of Rock Creek and included all that was left of the tract south of this branch and west of Rock Creek, touching Georgetown on the north and east of the town. For purposes of identification, I call the streets of Georgetown by their present useful but uninteresting names. They were known in those days, and until comparatively recent times, as Bridge, Gay, Beall, West, Back—or Stoddert—Montgomery, Green, Washington, Congress and High Streets. In 1751, when Georgetown was laid out, it extended nearly to N Street, on the north, and to Thirtieth Street on the east. But when Thomas Beall inherited the Rock of Dumbarton, in 1780, the town had grown wonderfully. One

³ See *History of the National Capital*, by W. B. Bryan, page 191 and footnote.

⁴ *Ibid.*,

⁵ *Ibid.*, pages 58-9.

of the Commissioners appointed by Washington to locate the Capital, reported in 1781 that it had been, for some years past, the best market for tobacco in the State, if not in the United States. The town began at the Potomac on the south and had grown as far as the same river on the west, and in 1780 its only outlet was to the north and east, on Thomas Beall's land. But in 1780 the Revolutionary War was still in progress, and all business and building activities were at a standstill. Three years later, however, in 1783—the year the Treaty of Peace was signed—Thomas Beall incorporated sixty-one acres of the Rock of Dumbarton as an addition to Georgetown, which is still known as Beall's First Addition. It did not include the land on which Bellevue stood, which was in Beall's Second Addition, incorporated in 1789, but it included practically, all his land up to the limits of the Bellevue lot. Old Georgetown was laid out like a checker board; the streets ran due north and south and east and west, and the squares were of uniform size, and when Thomas Beall laid out his new subdivision—as we would call it now—he necessarily followed the same plan. He continued the Georgetown streets farther east and north and he opened new streets parallel to them and the same distance apart. When the town was laid out in 1751 it stopped just three squares west and about three short squares south of the spot where Bellevue stood, and it did not require a surveyor to see what would happen when the street, now called Q, was opened. Any one with two physical feet could have stepped it off and seen that the new street would run directly through that spot, and if there was a house there, and it was not moved, the street would stop about two hundred feet west of the nearest cross street. In like manner 27th Street, if it were continued north, would cross Q Street at exactly the same point. And that was just what the two streets did. An old map of Georgetown, made in 1796, shows Q Street crossing 28th Street and stopping when it had gone about 200 feet, with no outlet, north, east or south. And 27th Street ran as far north as P Street—which was the southern limit of the Bellevue lot,—and turned to the east and ran round the property, while on the other side of the lot, Q Street began

again and ran to the bank of Rock Creek. This is a matter of determining importance to our investigations, for my mind is so constructed, and I think your minds are also, that I cannot believe that the man who owned the land and made the Addition and planned and laid out the streets where they would inevitably run, would deliberately have built a large brick house right in the middle of Q Street where it would cross 27th Street, if the street were continued north. This fact is conclusive evidence, to my mind, that Bellevue was built before George Beall died; that it was standing on the same spot when Thomas Beall inherited the land and that it had been standing there for a great many years. It is not uncommon for a street to stop when it meets another street without crossing it, but I do not recall any other instance where one street crosses another and proceeds about one third of the square and then stops, with no outlet in any direction. But Q Street not only did this, in 1796 and earlier, but it "waited patiently about" without proceeding on its way, for more than one hundred and twenty years, until 1915, when the house was moved and Q Street was cut through the bluff where the house had stood, to connect with the Q Street bridge over Rock Creek. The map to which I referred was made in 1796, but N, O, P and Q streets must have been opened earlier, possibly soon after 1783, for there is a Maryland Ordinance, passed in 1795, appointing Commissioners to extend these same streets farther West until they would intersect Wisconsin Avenue—then called High Street—showing that they had already been opened to the east. Another ordinance adopted the same year, provides that "any building which interferes with or stands on any street, lane or alley shall not be deemed a nuisance but may stand and be occupied by the present owner." By 1789 Thomas Beall had incorporated Bellevue and the adjacent land as Beall's Second Addition to Georgetown.

After 1790, when the District of Columbia was selected as the seat of the Government, there was the wildest speculation in land in Georgetown. Prices rose and fell with feverish activity, and the story of Bellevue between 1796 and 1804 is an apt illustration. For in June, 1796, Thomas Beall sold the house

and lot to Peter Casenave for £250. A pound sterling had a far greater value in those days than it has now, and £250 was a fair price for a four and one eighth acre lot and what was probably, at that time, an old house. The deed describes the lot in feet,—an irregular, five-sided lot containing four and one eighth acres, “together with the buildings, improvements, privileges and appurtenances thereunto belonging.” Two months later, in August, 1796, Casenave sold the property to Uriah Forrest at an advance of twenty per cent in the price. In 1797, a year later, Forrest sold it to Isaac Pollack for five times what he had paid for it. Isaac Pollack kept it for a year, and in 1798, sold it to Samuel Jackson for less than half what it had cost him. A year later, in 1799, Samuel Jackson mortgaged it to William Shannon for nearly twice what he had paid for the entire property. He deeded it later to Philip Fitzhugh, who again mortgaged it to Joshua Bond and Frederick Shaeffer; and about the year 1804 the mortgages were foreclosed, and the property was bought by Gabriel Duval, who was then Comptroller of the Currency for the United States, and later, for thirty-five years, a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Duval sold it, the same year, 1805, to Joseph Nourse—Register of the United States Treasury, who paid a total of \$8,581.87, including interest, to satisfy the mortgages. Nourse was born in London, fought in the Revolution, was Secretary to General Charles Lee and Auditor of the Board of War. In 1813 he sold Bellevue to Charles Carroll—(who gave it its name)—for \$20,000, and built “The Highlands” on a large tract of land which he purchased, on a part of which the Washington Cathedral now stands.

If the house was standing in 1780, when Thomas Beall inherited the land then the house must have been built by his father George Beall, 1st, or by his grandfather, Ninian Beall, for these two men had owned the land for 77 years, from the time when it was patented, in 1703 to 1780. I do not think that Ninian built it, for he was seventy-eight years old when he patented the land, and men of that age are not apt to build large houses. He cultivated the estate, however, for in his will

he leaves it to his son George "with all the stock thereon, both cattle and hogs, them and their increase, unto my said son George."

But if Ninian Beall did not build the house, it must have been built by his son George, for he was the sole owner of the land for sixty-three years, from 1717 to 1780. But *when* did he build it? Surely not during the Revolution when he was eighty-one years old; and probably not after his wife's death which occurred in 1748. He did not marry again and why should he build such a house when he was a widower of fifty-three and his elder children were grown? He was 22 years old in 1717, when his father died; he had been married for more than a year to Elizabeth Brooke, of the well known Brooke family, and he was a man of wealth and importance. His wife bore thirteen children and she died in 1748 and was buried, we are told, in the family burying ground near her husband's house. The authorities differ as to the location of this burying ground; it was either on N Street, near 30th Street, or on Q Street between 33rd and 34th Streets. Either location was as "near" Bellevue as family burying grounds were apt to be located in those days. We are, therefore, forced to conclude that George Beall 1st built Bellevue before his wife's death in 1748, when similar houses were being built in Maryland and Virginia.

Until the year 1915 no one questioned the fact that Bellevue was of very great antiquity, and many were the stories told of Lafayette, Dolly Madison and other great folk who were entertained there. The house then stood, somewhat haughtily aloof, on a high bluff, blocking the path of Q Street, as who should say: "Thus far and no farther," to the old thoroughfare. From its proud eminence, it overlooked Rock Creek, Washington City, Georgetown, Annapolis Island and the broad reaches of the Potomac. And here many of us wished that it might remain, becoming a Bellevue Circle, like Dupont, Thomas and the other beautiful Circles which ornament the Capital. But in 1915 it was moved back, some hundred feet, or more, on its own lot, and Q Street was cut through the bluff on which it had

stood, to connect with Q Street, on the Washington side, by means of the beautiful Q Street bridge.

After it was moved, and after the two wings had been taken down and rebuilt—for they had no cellars and therefore could not be moved with the main body of the house; and especially after certain histories and papers, had circulated two errors—to which I shall refer, later on—a doubt was raised as to the age of the house, and it was forthwith assigned to the period when other interesting old houses were built in Georgetown and Washington of which Evermay, Tudor Place, The White House, and the Octagon, are examples. We know all about these houses; we know when they were built, we know the architect who designed them, and in some cases we have his drawings of the plans. We know, for example, that when Joseph Nourse sold Bellevue to Charles Carroll, in 1813, he built The Highlands, on the Tennallytown Road. And yet we are told that The Highlands is one hundred and fifty years old—older, it is claimed, than Bellevue. But if Bellevue was built at this time, why is it that we know nothing whatever about its date save that in 1796, Thomas Beall sold it to Peter Casenave, for £250? Evermay, to the north of Bellevue, was built in 1794, we know who built it; we know the price that was paid for the land, which also belonged to Thomas Beall and was part of The Rock of Dumbarton. Bellevue was larger than Evermay, and more beautiful; why do we know nothing about it, unless it is because it had stood there for so long that it had almost become a part of the landscape.

TWO POPULAR ERRORS.

I do not think that any one would have doubted that George Beall built Bellevue long before the Revolution, but for the two errors mentioned above. One of them occurs in the following statement in a paper read before the Columbia Historical Society:

“It (Bellevue) went to Nourse through a chancery suit instituted by the United States against the several parties who

held under Casenave. The fact that the dwelling had been erected shortly before 1802 appears in the proceedings. . . .”

You will recall that Bellevue was sold to Gabriel Duval in 1804, in foreclosing the mortgages held by William Shannon, and others, which were executed by Samuel Jackson and others, in 1799; and if this is true, then “those who held under Casenave” had “nothing to do with the case.” I have had a careful investigation made of these “proceedings,” and they recite that in 1805, Joseph Nourse

“ . . . paid to William Shannon and others, for amount of a house and lot in Georgetown sold at public auction on the 4th of May, 1804, in pursuance of a decree of the court for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States versus Samuel Jackson and others, which property was purchased by Gabriel Duval in behalf of the public, and by him resold to the said Joseph Nourse. . . .”⁶

There is no mention here of “the several parties who held under Casenave,” nor any reference to the date when Bellevue was built. But in making these investigations, a chancery suit was discovered (No. 39, docket 1) which *was* instituted by Thomas Beall against the heirs of Peter Casenave—“those who held under Casenave,”—and the proceedings show that about the year 1794—“shortly before 1802”—Thomas Beall built a large brick house on 30th and Dumbarton Streets.⁷ We can but suppose that the author of the paper confused this Chancery suit with the suit under which Bellevue was first sold, and that he mistook the house on N Street for Bellevue. It was a natural error, for Thomas Beall had sold Bellevue to Casenave the same year that the suit was brought, shortly before Casenave’s death.

⁶ Extract from copy of old deed, Liber U, p. 279, Recorder of Deeds Office, Washington, D. C.

⁷ These proceedings contain a receipt signed by Thomas Beall for \$400. “in part payment of three lots in my first addition to Georgetown near my new building on Gay Washington and Dumbarton”—N, 30th and Dumbarton Streets—dated December 6, 1794.

It happens that this latter Chancery suit also contradicts the other error, which is a statement in "The Brooke Family of Whitechurch," by Thomas Willing Balch, that George Beall lived in a large brick house which he built on N Street, near 31st. Balch adds in a footnote: "It may be that this house was built by his son Thomas Beall." Balch would not have added this footnote if he had not had reason to believe it was true, but each subsequent historian has copied the first statement and built important theories upon it and has paid no attention to the footnote. Chancery 39 proves that Thomas Beall *did* build the house on N Street after George Beall's death, and that George Beall could not have lived there.

These two errors—that the records of a chancery suit show that Bellevue was built "shortly before 1802"; and that George Beall built and lived in the house on N Street, near 31st,—have been the prolific parents of numerous errors with regard to the property.

In giving this abbreviated history I have omitted many details which add to the strength of the position I have taken. But they would add too much to the length of this paper, and I regard the facts cited as sufficiently conclusive.

The few traditions that have come down to us concerning Bellevue tell the same story. When Samuel Whitall of Philadelphia, leased the house in 1820, it was very old; so old that the roof was decayed and in danger of falling in. This fact is stated in a letter in my possession written by a Miss Rittenhouse, who was a granddaughter of Samuel Whitall. She was born at Bellevue, and her mother—Sarah Whitall Rittenhouse—was born there in 1822 and lived there for the seventy odd years of her life. But the roofs of houses that are built as well as Bellevue is built do not decay in fifty or in sixty years. Mount Vernon, when it was bought by the Mount Vernon Association had not been re-shingled for one hundred and two years. It was sadly out of repair, but it had not fallen in.

Still another way of determining the age of a house is its architecture; and experts can sometimes settle the age of a house

as geologists can decide the age of a fossil. Bellevue is decidedly colonial and not post-Revolutionary in its architecture. We are apt to describe the many columned houses which were so popular in the South, as colonial houses; we even call the tall pillars "colonial columns." But Professor Fiske Kimball, in a series of lectures delivered at the Metropolitan Museum, has described the marked change that took place in American architecture and other arts, after the Revolution. The American people, he explains, were full of the glory of their independence, and wedded to the idea of a great Republic, and they turned to classic models to express their ideas. For they felt themselves more akin to the Republics of Greece and of Rome, than to the Monarchies of Western Europe. They no longer named their cities Georgetown, Richmond, Charleston, and Boston; but Athens, Rome, Ithaca, Corinth and Sparta, and in their houses they adapted the columns and the pediments of Grecian temples to domestic uses. But Bellevue, I repeat, is distinctly pre-Revolutionary, or colonial, in its architecture. It has all the characteristics of the colonial period, including the square, hipped roof, with a flat deck and a balustrade round it and round the eaves—and Bellevue had a balustrade round the eaves before it was moved. It has the central pavilion, projecting more or less, with its gable cutting into the roof; the arched window above the entrance, and the semi-circular window projecting into the tympanum of the gable. It has the many-paned windows, with heavy strips between the panes; the Palladian window on the stairway, the "quoins" on the corners and other architectural features characteristic of that period, as well as the long, low wings, projecting at either end of the central mass, which we see in Westover, Chatham, Mount Clare, Hampton and the important houses in Annapolis. It was evidently the country home of a wealthy planter, built near a river landing like other plantation homes in Virginia and Maryland.

The site of Washington was not the scene of any great event in colonial times; nor was Bellevue the home of the most immortal characters in our history. But Washington is the Capital

of the Nation, and Bellevue dates from its earliest settlement. It was a typical, American country home of the better class, and was built, owned and lived in, from time to time, by men who were prominent and useful, in colonial times and down to the present day, in military, legislative, judicial, naval and political life. It represents a cross-section of American life and history from colonial times down to the present. And when we remember that the small lot on which it now stands was part of the great tract called the Rock of Dumbarton, which included a large part of Georgetown and all of Montrose Park, Oak Hill Cemetery and beautiful Rock Creek Park; that the house was built by the owner of this tract, and that it antedated the other Georgetown houses, as well as these parks, does it not acquire a new interest in our eyes? I think, too, that we may safely conclude that to it we owe the fact that such beautiful estates as Evermay, Greyholme, Tudor Place, The Bowie House and Monterey are still to be found in Georgetown and that it has preserved to this day its quaint, old time atmosphere, its roomy houses and its beautiful trees. For, as we have said, Bellevue blocked the entrance to Georgetown, for more than one hundred and twenty years. There were three bridges across Rock Creek, connecting Georgetown with Washington; one on Pennsylvania Avenue, one on M Street and one on P Street; but none of them were attractive to residents. Q Street was the natural link between the best residential parts of the two cities, and Q Street was effectively closed by the Bellevue house. Possibly, had the Heights of Georgetown been more easily available for residences it might have been shorn of its historic beauty and interest, and built up in solid blocks of uninteresting houses characteristic of a certain period in Washington's architectural history.

The National Society has a very important list of accomplishments to its credit. It has restored the old Church at Jamestown; built the monument at Arlington to the victims of the Spanish-American War; equipped the operating rooms on our Hospital Ships; built the canopy over Plymouth Rock;

and raised an endowment of one hundred and twelve thousand dollars for Sulgrave Manor in England. It has also contributed liberally to nearly a dozen other enterprises: to Wakefield; Monticello; the John Marshall House; the Carlisle House; the Navy Memorial; Valley Forge; Pohick Church; the home of Mary Washington; Kenmore and other similar objects. But none of these things will rival in interest to the public, the preservation of this old house which connects modern Washington with the colonial history of the nation.

"THE FIRST MAN UP SAN JUAN HILL."

BY DE COURCY W. THOM.

This is a tale of daring-do. It recounts the heroic record of a Maryland man at the Battle of San Juan Hill, Cuba, on July 1st, 1898, in the Spanish-American War and on several other occasions. Our hero is Henry Anson Barber, son of the Reverend Theodore P. Barber and his wife Anna C. Hooper, of Cambridge, Dorchester County, Maryland, where "Hal," as we called him at the Episcopal High School of Virginia, was born and generally had his residence until about 1882 when he adventured to St. Louis, Missouri, in search of fame and fortune. There and thereabouts his funds were soon exhausted. He would not ask financial support from his home folks. He could not secure steady employment and was reduced to doing any odd job, such as his first job that of holding a man's riding horse, and such as carrying a hod and then, as the jade fortune denied his wooing, there and afterwards in Mexico, "Hal" sought fame at the cannon's mouth—he joined the Army as a private on March 5th, 1885, in Baltimore, Maryland, intensely determined to win an officer's commission. That was a difficult thing to accomplish in those days but sometimes done by men of good family without political pull.

The Adjutant's General's Office in the War Department, Washington, D. C., has kindly furnished me with the following statement of military service of Henry A. Barber:—

War Department
The Adjutant General's Office
Washington

AG-Officers-RB-MMR-434

December 7, 1928.

STATEMENT OF MILITARY SERVICE OF
HENRY A. BARBER

Born at Cambridge, Maryland, August 20, 1862.

Appointed from the Army.

Private, Corporal, Sergeant and 1st Sergeant

Troop E, 7th Cavalry..... Mch. 5, 1885
to..... Mch. 3, 1889

2nd Lieutenant, 1st Cavalry..... Feb. 11, 1889

1st Lieutenant, 9th Cavalry..... Aug. 27, 1896

Captain..... Feb. 2, 1901

Transferred to 28th Infantry..... Dec. 26, 1901
(to rank from February 2, 1901)

Major, Assistant Chief, Record and Pension Office..... Apr. 23, 1904

Retired July 31, 1904

Graduate: Infantry and Cavalry School 1893.

SERVICE

He was on duty with the 1st Cavalry at Fort Custer, Montana Territory, from April 21, 1889 (with troop B in the field and at Fort Keogh, M. T., November 24, 1890 to February 8, 1891, in connection with Sioux Campaign in South Dakota) to March 10, 1891; Student, Infantry and Cavalry School, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to June 22, 1893; under orders to join regiment and on leave to October 15, 1893; with regiment at Fort Bayard, New Mexico (in the field on scout November and December 1893) to September 1895; at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, to January, 1896; Fort Reno, Oklahoma, to February 15, 1897; at Fort DuChesne, Utah, to April 1898; en route to Cuba and in Santiago Campaign; participated in Battles of Las Guasimas, June 24, San Juan July 1-3, and Siege of Santiago, July 4-17, 1898; on sick leave August 20 to October 30, 1898; rejoined regiment at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, November 5, 1898; with regiment at this post to July 1, 1900; en route to Philippine Islands and on leave to August 7, 1900; with regiment at Albay, Guinobatan (sick in hospital Manila, P. I., February 6 to April 1, 1901) to April 19, 1901; on General Court Martial duty at Manila to June, 1901; with regiment at Guinobatan, P. I., to July 1, 1901; en route to United States and on sick leave to September 9, 1902, when he rejoined regiment at San Francisco de Malabon, P. I.; changed station with regiment to Iligan, P. I., January 1, 1903; at Iligan

to December 15, 1903; arrived with regiment in United States January 14, 1904; at Presidio of San Francisco, California, to March 3, 1904; on leave to June 17, 1904; sick in United States General Hospital, D. C. and on sick leave to July 31st, 1904, date of retirement.

He died December 31st, 1915.

C. H. Bridges,
Brigadier General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

A fine record that! Hal had not only risen in nineteen years from the ranks to a Majority but had incidentally educated himself in military learning, rendered splendid service and become such a soldier as to draw from his fellow soldier, President Theodore Roosevelt, the following appreciation expressed to Hal Barber's brother, Mr. W. W. Barber, a teacher in St. Mark's School, South Borough, Massachusetts, when Roosevelt went there to make an address:—"I want to tell you that he is my ideal of what a soldier should be." And Ex-President Roosevelt wrote Hal's widow from

Oyster Bay,
Long Island, N. Y.

February 7, 1916.

My dear Mrs. Barber:—

I hope you will not think it intrusive of me to write you this line of profound sympathy. I regarded your husband as typical of what was best in the American Army. I am glad, indeed, that your son is now at West Point and is to carry on the tradition.

With very deep sympathy and high regard, I am,

Faithfully yours,

Theodore Roosevelt.

Mrs. Inez Barber,
Cambridge, Maryland.

However, I knew nothing of the military details of Hal's life until in the Summer, I think it was, of 1902, or was it of 1904, when he dashed into my office in Baltimore, Maryland. We

had not met since our chummy school days at the “Episcopal High School,” near Alexandria, Virginia, where his joyous and gallant disposition and fleetness of foot had marked him out. Well, in he came to my office just as lithe and erect as when at the old School and with his brave blue eyes dancing and greeted me as of old. Soon we had brought one another up to date personally. Then he said, “‘Dick’ I am just back from lunching with ‘Teddy’ (he meant the great Theodore Roosevelt) at the ‘White House’ and I must tell you all about it.” Then our Maryland soldier told me the following tale:—“After the Spanish War I served in our Cavalry in the Philippines and fell sick, was invalided to the United States and there was advised by my doctors (among whom was the late Nathan S. Gorter of Baltimore, Maryland) that I ought to seek transfer of service. Teddy Roosevelt (then serving his first term as President) would help me in that I was confident for we had fought in company in Cuba; so today I attended one of his office receptions to the public. There I stood among senators and other prominent men and wondered when the busy President would be able to listen to my humble self. But he saw me and brushing through the big folk strode up to me and grasped my hand and said ‘I am delighted to see you again, Barber’ and heard my desire for the needed transfer and then said ‘stay to lunch with me today.’ I, too, was delighted. It gave me a chance to emphasize my need and soon at luncheon the President; who, when Colonel of the “Rough Riders,” had launched the general attack at the Battle of San Juan Hill, said with much good humor:—‘Barber, tell Mrs. Roosevelt who was the first man up San Juan Hill’ and I answered, ‘you might have been, Mr. President, but I was.’” Then Hal stated to me the following details of that achievement:

“On the day of the San Juan Hill fight the heat was almost prostrating to me despite the fact that I was protected by a white helmet which I had bought a few days previous. Hour after hour our Army lay in the grass at the foot of San Juan

Hill. I was temporarily serving in Captain J. F. McBlain's company of the ninth regiment (a colored one) in consequence of my having volunteered at Port Tampa, Florida, for active service in Cuba. The 71st New York regiment held the left of the line, then came the sixth cavalry regiment, then the ninth cavalry regiment, then the regiment of Rough Riders and then the tenth cavalry, while a regiment of regular infantry was stationed back of the 71st New York regiment and some artillery was stationed just back of our regiment—the 9th Cavalry (colored). After we had broiled a long time in the high grass an officer outranking me called for a volunteer to go down the line to Colonel Roosevelt and ask him if he had received any orders to charge. I volunteered and was about to start when someone substituted for the white helmet I was wearing an inconspicuous head covering because I had to run in full sight and easy range of the Spanish snipers until I reached Colonel Roosevelt. As I ran the Spaniards shot at me from the top of San Juan Hill but I was not wounded. I delivered my message to Colonel Roosevelt and was told by him that he had received no orders to charge but was willing to join the other Colonels of regiments in ordering the charge. I then ran back to my starting point but could not deliver my message as the officer who had sent me [Was it Lieutenant Colonel Hamilton of the 9th Cavalry? DeC. W. Thom.] was not there and I never did deliver it because he was incapacitated for service in the field before I saw him again. [Hal told me that such officer was shot through the eye. DeC. W. Thom.] Having resumed my white helmet as some little help against the terrible heat of the sun I laid down once more with my command. Suddenly there came an order to advance. We officers jumped up and ran in front of our men and drawing our sabres led them on. We got to a road fringed with trees and low bushes and laid down again. The nearest Spanish position was about 400 yards away on top of a hill. A stone house formed part of its defences. I got permission to take a few men and try to stop some of the firing from this hill. We crept out in the open field between us and the hill. I took a

rifle and aiming carefully fired several shots. My men fired carefully. Such a storm of bullets came in reply that I was bidden to stop as I was only drawing fire. For an hour or more, so it seemed, we laid in this road. Shells burst over us and the whisper of bullets was unceasing. Bits of leaves cut by them would fall on us. I was very tired and after saying a prayer slept awhile. I felt very badly. I did not expect to live, for I had a clear view of the Spanish trenches and thought it impossible that many should live out an assault on them, especially a company officer who would be in advance of his men. All this time shells were exploding but none exploded near us. The tension on the men was great. Suddenly a line of men appeared coming from our right. They were advancing through the long grass deployed as skirmishers and were under fire. At their head, or rather in front of them and leading them, rode Colonel Roosevelt. He was very conspicuous mounted as he was. The men were the Rough Riders so called being a combination of college boys and frontier men. I heard someone calling to them not to fire into us, and seeing Colonel Carroll—the Colonel of the 9th Cavalry—reported to him and was told to go out and meet them and caution them as to our position, we being between them and the enemy. I did so speaking to Colonel Roosevelt. I also told him we were under orders not to advance and asked him if he had received any orders. He replied that he was going to charge the Spanish trenches. I told this to Colonel Carroll and to Captain Dimmick our squadron commander.

A few moments after the word passed down that our left, Captain Taylor, was about to charge, Captain McBlain called out, “we must go on with those troops, we must support Taylor.” I called this to Captain Dimmick and he gave the order to assault. I tried to cut down the wire fence in front of us, having an excellent blade. It had been an old Japanese sword and I had had a regulation grip and hilt put on it. McBlain and myself called to our colored troop. I cut through the fence in several places, and my men rushed through. I called out ‘as skir-

mishers ' 'guide left' 'march' and our men deployed at double time. We were in a perfectly open field, the grass nearly up to our waists. A storm of bullets came but most went high. It sounded like a flock of birds passing overhead. Then came a strange thing, for a glorious, a beautiful feeling came over me such as I had never felt before. As the order had come to assault I had shut my eyes and said 'God have mercy on my soul and my Wife' and then as I rushed in front of my men this great wild feeling of delight came. Never before had come into me this feeling of heavenly exhilaration. I did not feel at all excited. My men were advancing, halting to fire. When we got within 200, perhaps more, yards of the hill, I ordered them to stop firing and they did so. Then I saw just behind our lines some 15 of the Rough Riders. They were firing right through us. I waved my sabre and called to them to stop. But they did not obey. I was about 30 yards in front of our line so I put my white helmet on the point of my sabre and held it high to attract attention and called to them and my colored troopers to come with me, that I would lead them to where they could fight hand to hand and could not miss. 'I am about to charge,' I cried out. 'Will you follow me, lads.' Some one of them shouted out 'we will go with you.' I gave the command to charge and we all cheered and advanced at a run not firing a shot. And so part of my colored troop and these Rough Riders started up the hill. [Please note that reference is here made to some of the above mentioned 15 of the Rough Riders. DeC. W. Thom.] Colonel Roosevelt, of the Rough Riders, started the whole movement on the left which was the first of the advance of the assault. We had to cross a little stream about waist deep and as I got into it I buried my face and neck in its sweet coolness. Just before reaching this stream a shell, low down, burst just after passing me and a sergeant of the troop, who was a few yards back of me, fell as if dead; but he was only stunned. Also, out of the long grass rose a guinea chick (we found them wild around Santiago) and a sergeant

raised his carbine laughing as he did so as though to shoot at it flying. After scrambling up the steep bank of the little stream I found myself within 60 yards of the summit and the house held by the Spaniards and my men some 30 yards back of me except three or four Rough Riders and the same number of my troop, that is, of Captain McBlain's company of colored troopers of the 9th regular cavalry, who were right up with me a few yards behind.

As I had run up the hill I passed the dead body of a Spaniard from whose knapsack had rolled out a little money, and further on I came across a second body from whose knapsack had rolled out a piece of hard-tack. There I made my first pause in this charge and stooped and picked up the hard-tack for it had been a very long time since I had had anything to eat. When I reached this point within 60 yards of the summit of San Juan Hill and the house upon it, some shots were fired at me by a few Spaniards who fled at once. I fired four shots from my six shooter but did not hit my man and in a moment we were where the Spaniards had been. This place in a manner flanked the rest of the Spanish line and a hot fire was opened on us from trenches some 500 yards away. Finding the men had their sights too high I sat down on top of the ridge and taking a rifle fired carefully target fashion with two men marking the shots. After awhile we got our sights properly adjusted and were successful in hitting. Just then Lieutenant A. L. Mills (1st Cavalry Aide) came up and we chatted with congratulations, etc. Someone called me Captain McBlain and told me to try and get some ammunition. As I walked along the line some 40 yards I came upon Colonel Hamilton's dead body. Just then Captain Taylor fell and was carried by me. I collected some belts of ammunition from dead and wounded men and then returned to the troop. In reaching the top of San Juan Hill I was first, then a few yards back of me came a few of my colored troopers of McBlain's company and a few of the Rough Riders."

That is the basis of Hal Barber's belief that he was the first man up San Juan Hill. The great President Roosevelt, then serving as Colonel of the Rough Riders, was satisfied that his command—mark you “his command”—was the first up. 1st Lieutenant Henry A. Barber's belief that he was first man up was maintained by his company Captain J. F. McBlain who wrote to Hal Barber from Fort Grant, Arizona, April 11th, 1899, as follows:—

“I suppose you have been reading Roosevelt's account of the Cuban Campaign, published in *Scribner's* in the April number, his description of the San Juan fight, he wrote to me to criticize it and to send in my comments so that he might correct errors before putting it out in book form. I told him I had no comments to make of any circumstances of any importance. I did tell him that I am absolutely certain that the first officer up San Juan Hill, called by some Kettle Hill, was Lieutenant Barber of the 9th Cavalry. I know this to be so, Barber, because as I jumped down into the San Juan you were throwing water over your head and face, and preceded me up the hill about 10 yards, and if you remember I called to some of the men to get up into the house to see if there were any Spaniards lurking there. *I went with the men over to where Hamilton was afterward killed and Taylor wounded and there was not a soul on the hill on the left of the house.* [Italics mine DeC. W. Thom.] I made this plain to Teddy but cannot satisfy him that his command was not the first up. . . . I made ‘The 9th Cavalry in Cuba’ the subject of a Lyceum paper, and I pride myself I made a fairly readable paper.”

On page 109 in the ‘Roosevelt Book’ occurs this entry about the battle of San Juan Hill:—“The first guidons planted there were those of the three New Mexican troops G E and F of my regiment and their Captains Llewellen, Luna and Miller; *but on the extreme right of the hill at the opposite end from where we struck it Captains Taylor and McBlain and their men of the 9th Cavalry were first up.* [Italics mine DeC. W. Thom.] Each of the five Captains was firm in the belief that

his troop was first up. As for the individual men each of whom honestly thought he was first on the summit, their name was legion." Surely, Hal Barber's claim that he was the first man upon the summit of San Juan Hill is not negatived by the Roosevelt assertion that the guidons of certain companies were the first guidons on the summit. Moreover, in addition to the above we have the definite statement which I have quoted from Captain McBlain in whose company 1st Lieutenant Barber was serving as a volunteer, that Barber was the first officer up. *Be it noted that when Captain McBlain reached the summit of San Juan Hill just after Hal Barber, he, McBlain, clearly viewed the summit of that Hill to the left of him and saw no one there; but that when Roosevelt with his three Companies did reach the summit, he, Roosevelt, saw thence to his "extreme right" the Taylor and McBlain Companies the latter of which Hal Barber had led as I have told you.* It happens, too, that I have this supporting statement made through a letter of the late Dr. Nathan R. Gorter of Baltimore to our comrade Hal Barber. It is as follows:—

"1 West Biddle Street,
Baltimore, Maryland,
March 13th, 1902.

"Captain Henry A. Barber,
My dear Hal:—

"On the 29th of September, 1898, I was called to see Mr. Robert Baker, who was a soldier in the Sixth Cavalry, and who, just before his death, gave me an account of the San Juan fight which should interest you, as you were the officer who wore the white helmet. Baker said:—

"‘I want to tell you of the most heroic thing in the Spanish War. We were all lying in the grass, at the foot of San Juan Hill. I was in the Sixth Cavalry; on our left was the Seventy-First, New York, behind them a regiment of regular infantry, which charged over the Seventy-First, the men of which lay upon their faces. Two companies of this regiment, however, went up with us. To the right was the Ninth Cavalry, a negro regiment

led by white officers; to their right were the Rough Riders and the Tenth Cavalry.

“ ‘The bullets were ringing around us and no one dared to lift his head, when suddenly, a young man sprang from the ranks of the Ninth Cavalry; he ran fifty yards ahead of his men—took off his helmet put it upon his sabre and stood, a target, with Spanish bullets hailing around him. With the voice of a trumpet, which thrilled me and set the negroes wild, he called out,

“ ‘Boys will you follow me?’

“ ‘The negroes shouted back,

“ ‘We will.’

“ ‘He then gave a yell and led up the hill, we, with the Rough Riders and the Tenth, closing in behind them. That young man was a lieutenant, . . . and he led with his helmet on his sabre. He was the only man who wore a white helmet, and he was on San Juan Hill fully fifty yards ahead of any one else.’

“I send this thinking it may some day be of use to you. With kind regards, believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

Nathan R. Gorter.”

The McBlain, the Roosevelt and the Baker statements concur in demonstrating that Hal Barber was the first man up San Juan Hill.

It seems to me clear, therefore, that on account of his gallantry and firstness in this historic charge up San Juan Hill, we may proudly add the name of Hal Barber to the glorious list of heroic Maryland soldiers on which shine especially for active, heroic and personal leadership in battle the names of Howard, of Williams, of Ringgold and of May.

In order to be an effective soldier natural capacity needs to be aptly trained. And the following additional incidents in Hal Barber's preparatory military education will interest us, I am sure. “He served nearly four years as Private, Corporal,

Sergeant and 1st Sergeant in Troop E, 7th Cavalry, studying indomitably in order to prepare for examination as an officer. He even read on horseback some of the history involved. He passed a good examination for a 2nd lieutenancy and on February 11, 1889, became a 2nd lieutenant in the 1st Cavalry. Within three months after he had received that appointment as an officer he was sent with a body of cavalry in pursuit of some Indians. He was the only officer in the detachment. After passing through a small town in the wilds of Wyoming, an encampment for the night was made a few miles beyond it. During the night the sergeant woke up Lieutenant Barber saying that the men had gotten hold of some whiskey and he could not do anything with them. While Lieutenant Barber was hastily dressing, the Sergeant mentioned the leader in the mutiny. This was at 3 o'clock in the morning. Lieutenant Barber went out and ordered his men to fall in line and nobody moved. He went up to the man whom the Sergeant had told him was the leader in the trouble and ordered him to go to his tent. The fellow just grinned. Lieutenant Barber knocked him senseless with a pistol and ordered the men to fall in line saying that he would kill the first man who refused to obey. He formed them as they were and drilled them for two hours, as if they were on parade, in the cold night in their night shirts until the nasty spirit was out of them. He then made them dress and break camp and march all day. He never had any more trouble with them." He was made 1st Lieutenant on August 27th, 1896, and transferred to the 9th Cavalry, a colored regiment. While a member of that regiment he took a long ride—over a hundred miles—carrying important papers that had to go through. He spared neither his horse nor himself. Through stress of that duty he injured one of his legs so severely as to finally necessitate his transfer to the Infantry.

I might give you many more instances of the efficiency and gameness of Hal Barber. I shall state only one more. It developed when Hal was in charge of a detachment protecting

a military camp in the Philippines in the Moro country. 'On two previous occasions the Moros had cut down a sentinel, sneaked up on the nearest tent, cut the tent guides and stabbed with spears the struggling men beneath. To break up that unpleasant "custom" Hal pitched a tent a little apart from the main tent, left it unguarded by a sentinel and ostentatiously occupied it with a squad of men. But at night he allowed no man to sleep in the tent. On the contrary, they slept on each side of the tent in the long grass about twenty-five yards away, and the Moros came and cut down and jabbed the empty tent. Then the men of the detachment rose on each side of them and killed or captured the whole band of Moros.'

I think I should mention one or two other thing before pressing this article to an end. While serving as Military Attaché in Cuba, Hal Barber organized a battery of mountain artillery for the Cuban Government and also translated the American drill regulations into Spanish. Thus we may say that he saw service in the cavalry, in the infantry and in the artillery.

In preparing this paper I have had the advantage of letters from the devoted widow of Major Henry A. Barber and of copies of letters from her husband to herself and to his mother. Mrs. Henry A. Barber was born Inez Smith, the daughter of Colonel Gilbert C. Smith, United States Army. It was from soldier's stock, then, on the mother's side as well as from the heroic subject of this paper that there came to their only child the present Captain Henry A. Barber, Jr., a West Pointer, the character which brought to him in the great World War the Distinguished Service Cross, the Chevalier's Cross of the French Legion of Honor and, also, the French Croix de Guerre with Palm. This is the record that brought those honors:—

"1st Lieutenant Henry A. Barber, 9th Machine Gun Battalion. For extraordinary heroism in action near Moulins, France, July 14-15, 1918. Seeing his right flank badly exposed to the enemy advance across the Marne, Lieutenant Barber changed the position of two of his guns to meet this emergency performing this test during terrific enemy fire. He then ran a

distance of 150 yards in the open to stop the fire of our own Infantry on our own troops. Going forward to the aid of a wounded soldier, Lieutenant Barber administered first aid and was carrying the wounded man to safety when the latter died. Picking up the one remaining undamaged gun he opened fire on the enemy who were crossing the river sinking one boat, killing many and causing the others to abandon their boats."

In the name of all Maryland I proudly salute such a record. And I thank him for the loan of his father's diary dealing with the battle of San Juan Hill and for another paper written by his father regarding some other phases of his career. I have had the advantage, also, of a pertinent letter from Mr. W. W. Barber, my friend's brother and a teacher in St. Mark's School, South Borough, Massachusetts, kindly affording me additional data about Hal Barber's military performances, and of one from that noble Christian gentleman, the late Dr. Brice W. Goldsborough, of Cambridge, Maryland, a schoolmate and life-long friend of Hal's and mine, imparting some Barber family information.

Do not these sample performances which I have set forth this evening concerning our fellow Marylander, my dear old comrade, Major Henry Anson Barber, stamp him as a soldier of the noblest mettle?

In moving a vote of thanks to Mr. Thom for the above paper, Mr. W. L. Marbury made the following remarks:—

"Hal Barber was a very dear friend of mine. We occupied the same room at Mrs. Turnbull's boarding house on Charles Street in the block in which Walter's Art Gallery is now located, before he enlisted in the United States Army. He mentioned to me a rather amusing incident in connection with the meeting with President Roosevelt after the Spanish American War, referred to in Mr. Thom's paper.

"Upon accepting the President's invitation to luncheon after the reception, to which Mr. Thom refers, Captain Barber found

that the only persons other than himself at the luncheon were Roosevelt himself, Mrs. Roosevelt and Secretary Elihu Root.

"Mr. Roosevelt began the conversation by saying to Barber that he wanted him to tell Mrs. Roosevelt about the incident of the assault on San Juan Hill and added 'Mrs. Roosevelt doesn't believe that I have ever been in Cuba and I want you to tell her all about it.' Thereupon Barber began to describe the scene, but he had not gone very far when Roosevelt himself broke in and was giving a very vivid picture of the situation in which he found himself when he reached the summit of the hill, and looking back, found that his men had not kept up with him and he was separated from them by quite a distance. At this point Mr. Root quoting from the then celebrated 'Mr. Dooley' was heard to murmur in sepulchral tones 'Alone in Cubia,'—whereupon Mrs. Roosevelt indulged in most unseemly merriment."

CHARLES CALVERT (1663-1733) AND SOME OF HIS DESCENDANTS.

By JOHN BAILY CALVERT NICKLIN.

Charles Calvert, eldest son of the Hon. William Calvert (1642-1682) (by his wife, Elizabeth Stone, daughter of Governor William Stone and his wife, Verlinda Cotton) and grandson of Governor Leonard Calvert (1606-1647), was born in 1663 and died in 1733. (Aug. 14, 1722, he gave his age as "59 years or thereabouts." Chancery Book No. 3, page 750, Annapolis. March 28, 1721, he gave his age as "57 years or thereabouts." Chancery Book No. 2, page 661. On page 706 of the same book, under date of Dec. 2, 1710, Robert Bowlin's testimony stated that "About 12 years ago was the full time of this deponent's being acquainted with Mr. Richard Calvert, he being then in Virginia along with his mother." Madam Elizabeth Calvert, widow of the Hon. William Calvert, evidently

remained unmarried after the death of her husband. On Feb. 11, 1707, she brought suit against Philip Lynes. On Aug. 19, 1720, it was stated that "Richard Calvert died intestate at the house of William Young. Charles Calvert, his brother, was his heir-at-law." Chancery Book No. 3, page 868. March 8, 1721, Joshua Doyne, aged 32, and Jesse Doyne deposed, stating that "Richard Calvert died in the fall of 1718." Chancery Book No. 3, page 874). On Dec. 14, 1669, "William Calvert, Esq., his Lordship's nephew, took the oath of a Justice of this Court in pursuance of his Lordship's instructions bearing date the eighth and twentieth day of July last past." (Liber JJ., page 33, Land Office, Annapolis. On page 40 he is mentioned as "Colonel William Calvert, Justice.")

Charles Calvert, Esq., moved from Charles County, Md., to Stafford County, Va. (across the Potomac River) about 1690. "Liber Y No. 1, page 346, La Plata, Md., Jan. 13, 170½. Charles Calvert late of Charles County, otherwise called Charles Calvert of Stafford County, Va., Gentleman." Liber No. 2, page 37, Westmoreland County, Va. June 26, 1695, Charles Calvert witnessed a deed from Charles Ashton to Joshua Hudson. Sept., 16, 1688. "Charles Calvert, Esq., son and Heire of William Calvert, Esq., Deceased, and of Elizabeth ye widow and Relict of ye said William" and daughter of William Stone, deceased. Liber No. 14, page 35. Jan. 14, 1689. Charles Calvert, Esq., of St. Mary's County to Charles Egerton of said County, Merchant. April 5, 1690. Charles Calvert appeared before John Courts and John Addison, Justices of Charles County. In Stafford County, Va., 169½ Charles Calvert married, as his first wife, Mary Howson (who died before 1699), daughter and co-heiress of Robert and Sarah Howson (the former being referred to as a "Merchant," which term was rather broadly used in the seventeenth century). Robert Howson came to Virginia about 1660. (Virginia Colonial Decisions, Thurston vs. Pratt. "Robert Howson was seized in fee of 450 acres of land—and died leaving issues 3 daughters: Anne, who married Rice Hooe; Mary who married Charles Calvert and Frances, who died unmarried." Northern

Neck Land Book No. 3, page 91, Richmond, Va. "Robert Howson of the County of Stafford. Whereas Charles Calvert alledges that he hath been for many years in possession of 418½ acres as marrying Mary ye daughter and co-heir of the aforesaid Robert Howson, by whom he hath issue two daughters, viz: Sarah Howson and Ann Calvert." April 3, 1705. Sarah Howson Calvert and Ann Calvert, their Escheat Deed for 218½ acres of land in Stafford. Ibid.). Late in life Charles Calvert, then a widower, returned to Maryland and died in St. Mary's County at the close of the year 1733. (His will was probated there on Dec. 31, 1733, and he cut his two daughters off with the proverbial shilling! They were, of course, provided for before their marriages.) (Liber W-Z., page 33, Stafford County, Va. "This note shall oblige me to deliver the two mulatto Children to Mrs. Hewitt to keep for my two Children, the mulatto Girl for Sarah Howson Calvert and the Mulatto Boy for Ann Calvert. As Witness my hand 14th October, 1699." Signed: Charles Calvert. Witnesses: Robert Alexander and John Allan. "October ye 16, 1699. Then Reced of Charles Calvert for the use of my two Granddaughters the within mentioned Mulattos. I say Reced by me." Signed: "Sarah Hewitt. Recorded 8th May, 1700." Mrs. Sarah Howson, widow of Robert Howson, married, secondly, Robert Hewitt who died in 1692.) Liber W-Z., page 277. Charles Calvert from the Proprietors of the Northern Neck 200 acres, April 4, 1703. For 980 pounds of tobacco Charles Calvert sells this land to William Fitzhugh, April 9, 1705. "At a Court held for Stafford County, June 14, 1705, Charles Calvert in person acknowledged this sale or assignment of land to Coll. William Fitzhugh—and is recorded by Nath. Pope, Cl. Cur." Charles Calvert married, secondly, in Maryland, Barbara Kirk, who survived him, by whom he had no issue. By his first marriage to Mary Howson he had two daughters:

- I. Sarah Howson Calvert, born about 1694.
- II. Anne Calvert, born about 1696.

Of these daughters, Sarah Howson Calvert married (after

1717 and before 1726) Nathaniel Jones (1696-1754) (probably a descendant of Nathaniel Jones who died in Westmoreland County, Va., in 1662; wife Judith Jones. John Jones died in Westmoreland County in 1713, leaving two sons, Nathaniel and Charles, and three daughters, Elizabeth, Sarah and Anne Jones. The son Nathaniel was probably the husband of Sarah Howson Calvert.) This Nathaniel Jones died in Westmoreland County in 1754 and in his will mentioned his wife, Sarah Howson Jones; sons: John, David, Nathaniel, Charles and Calvert; daughters: Mary Peck, Sarah Franklin, and Frances Jones). The issue of Nathaniel Jones and his wife, Sarah Calvert, may therefore be set down as follows:

- I. John Jones (died 1762), who married, Aug. 16, 1744, Eleanor Moss, daughter of John Moss (died 1746) and his wife, Margaret ———.
- II. David Jones, who married, Feb. 18, 1763, Mary Boswell.
- III. Nathaniel Jones, Jr.
- IV. Charles Jones.
- V. Calvert Jones (who was appointed "Overseer of the Highways" in Westmoreland County in 1757).
- VI. Mary Jones, who married ——— Peck.
- VII. Sarah Jones, who married ——— Franklin.
- VIII. Frances Jones.

Of these, John Jones married, Aug. 16, 1744, Eleanor Moss and they had issue:

- I. Charles Calvert Jones, born June 4, 1746.
- II. Behethland Jones, born July 14, 1748; married, Feb. 14, 1770, John Peed and they had a daughter, Mildred Peed, who was born Sept. 22, 1772.
- III. Nathaniel Jones, III., born Feb. 25, 1751.
- IV. Sabra Jones, born Oct. 7, 1753; married, Feb. 8, 1778, William Crank.
- V. Jane Jones, born March 16, 1762; married, June 3, 1782, Samuel Marshall.
- VI. Eleanor Jones, who married, Dec. 27, 1774, Daniel Hamet.

Anne Calvert, the other daughter of Charles and Mary (Howson) Calvert, married, before 1714, Thomas Porter (who died Feb. 26, 1740) (Liber 5, page 253, Westmoreland County, Va. March 30, 1714. "Sarah Howson Calvert, Thomas Porter and Anne, his wife, which Sarah, Thomas and Anne are of the

County of Stafford, to John Pratt, 200 acres of land in Westmoreland County, part of a patent granted to Robert Howson, April 15, 1667, whose heirs the said Sarah Howson Calvert and Anne Porter are"). In his will (recorded in Book M., Stafford County, page 285) Thomas Porter mentioned his sons: Calvert, Thomas, Benjamin, Nicholas, Joseph, Charles and John; daughters: Howson, and Anne; wife Anne; brother Samuel. (Sons, except Calvert, were under 18). The issue of Thomas and Anne (Calvert) Porter may therefor be set down as follows:

- I. Anne Porter, born Oct. 13, 1717; died Sept. 22, 1727.
- II. Henry Porter, "baptized ye 1 of May, 172 $\frac{3}{4}$." (Register of St. Paul's Parish).
- III. Joseph Porter, born Aug. 7, 1726/7; married, Feb. 24, 1756, Jemima Smith of Overwharton Parish, Stafford County.
- IV. Howson Porter, who married, Jan. 1, 1746, John Starke¹ and died April 11, 1755. (John Starke married, secondly, May 29, 1756, Hannah Eaves and they had a son, James Starke, born Feb. 7, 1757.) By his first wife, Howson Porter, he had issue:
 1. Elizabeth Starke, born Aug. 16, 1749.
 2. Sarah Starke, born Jan. 29, 1752.
 3. William Starke, born Dec. 14, 1754.
- V. Calvert Porter, who married, Sept. 21, 1749, Elizabeth Cash (He was a Revolutionary Soldier from Virginia.) They had issue:
 1. Joseph Porter, Jr., born Oct. 21, 1750.
 2. Calvert Porter, Jr., born March 1, 1752.
 3. Thomas Porter, III, born Jan. 11, 1754.
 4. Frances Porter, born Jan. 12, 1756.
 5. Charity Porter, born Sept. 9, 1757.
- VI. Anne Porter, born March 15, 1732.
- VII. John Porter, born Aug. 4, 1734; died July 14, 1754; s. p.
- VIII. Thomas Porter, Jr.
- IX. Benjamin Porter.
- X. Nicholas Porter.
- XI. Charles Porter.

(Among the Revolutionary Soldiers from Virginia were: Calvert, Benjamin, Nicholas and Thomas Porter.)

In Stafford County, Va., at the close of the seventeenth century the names of Charles Calvert and his brother, George Calvert, and the latter's son, John Calvert, appear. In the

¹ Son of James and Elizabeth (Thornton) Starke.

Stafford County Order Book appears the following entry: "Oct. 8, 1690. George Calvert vs. John Tarkington" and on Nov. 10, 1692, another suit was filed by this George Calvert, "formerly of Charles County, Md." Charles Calvert's signature appeared under date of Oct. 14, 1699. On Dec. 9, 1703, the Stafford County Court ordered Mr. John Calvert paid one thousand pounds of tobacco for killing two wolves. When Prince William County was taken out of Stafford County, in 1730, John Calvert and his son, George Calvert, Jr., were thrown in the new county, where the former probably died; the latter later moved to and died in Culpeper County, Va., as George Calvert, Sr. His inventory was filed there May 12, 1782. Charles Calvert had previously returned to Maryland where he died three years after the formation of the new county. On Jan. 20, 1724, Thomas, Lord Fairfax, granted to George Calvert of Stafford County land on both sides of Powell's Creek (Then in Stafford, but later in Prince William County). On July 18, 1724, Thomas, Lord Fairfax, granted to Jacob Gibson and John Calvert (who was the son of George Calvert, Sr., and father of George Calvert, Jr.) of Stafford County "306 acres situate and being located between the branches of Powell's Creek in the County of Stafford and the north Run of Quanticot Creek, paying yearly 1 shilling sterling for every 50 acres."

The name Behethland given to the daughter of John and Eleanor (Moss) Jones and granddaughter of Nathaniel and Sarah Howson (Calvert) Jones, indicates descent from Walter Jones who married Behethland Newton, daughter of Captain Thomas Newton (1678-1727) and his wife, Elizabeth Storke (1687-1759), daughter of Nehemiah Storke (died 1693) who married Behethland Gilson (1666-1693), daughter of Major Andrew Gilson of Stafford County, who married Behethland Dade, widow of Frances Dade (died 1663) and daughter of Captain Thomas Bernard of Warwick County, Va., whose wife Mary Bernard, was a daughter of Captain Robert Behethland who came to Virginia with Captain John Smith in 1607. (See the writer's article on Robert Behethland in the January

issue of *The William & Mary Quarterly*). Nathaniel Jones, husband of Sarah Howson Calvert, was probably a descendant of the Nathaniel Jones who died in Westmoreland County in 1662; his widow, Judith Jones, married, secondly, John Whiston. He (Nathaniel Jones) was living in Westmoreland County as early as 1654 when Governor Richard Bennett granted to John Smith of Stanley Hundred 3,000 acres of Land in Westmoreland County adjoining the lands of Nicholas Lambson, Nathaniel Jones, Capt. Thomas Davis, John Williams, Stephen Norman, John Ewalton and Gervase Dodson, for the transportation of himself and nineteen other persons to the Colony of Virginia. ("John Smith" was an alias of Francis Dade, supra, first husband of Behethland Bernard) (1635-1720) (q. v.).

AUTHORITIES: Court records of Westmoreland, Stafford, and Prince William Counties, Virginia; Charles, St. Mary's and Prince George's Counties, Maryland; and the records of the Land Offices at Richmond and Annapolis. Also the Registers of St. Paul's and Overwharton Parishes, Virginia (Stafford and King George Counties). (Mrs. Ella Foy O'Gorman, of Washington, D. C., has very kindly assisted in the preparation of this little sketch). Compare, also, the writer's sketch of the Calvert Family in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* for the year 1921, especially pages 191 and 192.

MARYLAND RENT ROLLS.

[Continued from Vol. XXIV, No. 1, March, 1929.]

Duvals delight

1000 A: Sur: 9th Octob 1694 for John Duvall
lying on the North East Side of Patt. Riv^r

Poss^r John Duvall

Rent —.. 2.. —

Cheyney's Neck

80 A: Sur: 11th May 1696 for W^m Burroughs
on the South Side So: River Rent —.. 3.. 2½
Poss^r W^m Burroughs

Ridgly's Chance

305 A: Sur: 2^d Octob 1694 for Will^m Ridgly
at Rogue's Harbour Rent —.. 12.. 2½
Poss^r W^m Ridgly

Turkey Neck

200 A: Sur: 23 Ap: 1697 for Richard Snow-
don in the Fork of Pattuxent Riv^r Rent —.. 8.. —
Poss^r Rich^d Snowdon

What-You-Will

373 A: Sur: 2^d Xber 1699 for John Duvall
lying above the head of South River Rent —.. 14.. 11
Poss^r John Duvall

Pinkston's Folly

180 A: Sur: 1st July 1700 for Peter Pinkston
in Rogue's Harbour Rent —.. 7.. 2½
Poss^r Peter Pinkston

Elk Thicket Nil

Ovenwood Thicket

200 A: Sur: 26: June 1688 for Leonard Way-
man in the Fork of Puttuxent River Rent —.. 8.. —
Poss^r Same Wayman

Elizabeth's Fancy

225 A: Sur: 1st June 1700 for Rich^d Clark on
the South Side of South River Rent —.. 9.. —
Poss^r George Parker in Right of his Children
which he had by the daughter & hier of Gabriel
Parrot

Lugg Ox

780 A: Sur: 10: Octob 1701 for John Duvall
 near the head of South River Rent 1.. 11.. 2
 Poss^r Benj^a Wharfield

Souldiers Fortune

100 A: Sur: 8th Xber 1701 for Rich^d Snowdon
 Jun^r upon the North Bra: of Pat. Riv^r near
 Ivy hill Rent —.. 4.. —
 Poss^r Tim: Ragan

Littletown

280 A: Sur: 22^d June 1703 for John Sumers in
 the fork of Puttuxent River Rent —.. 11.. 2½
 Poss^r John Sumers

Kings Venture

50 A: Sur: 26 May 1704 for Jos: King in the
 Fork of Puttuxent River Rent —.. 2.. —
 Poss^r Jos: King

Walters's Lott

711 A: Sur: 18th Xber 1705 for Rich^d Snowdon
 Jun^r in the Fork of Puttuxent on the North
 Side of Robinhoods Forrest Rent 1.. 8.. 5
 Poss^r Wid^o Walters for the Orpⁿ of Walters

Effords Delight

176 A: Sur: 1st July 1703 for W^m Efford on
 the No: Side of Robinhoods Forrest at the Head
 of Coblers Bra: Rent —.. 7.. 0
 Poss^r W^m Efford

Honest Man's Lot

110½ A: Sur: 12th Xber 1704 for John
 Duvall on the No: Bra: at the head of So:
 River Rent —.. 4.. 5
 Poss^r John Duvall

Mitchell's Addition

181½ A: Sur: 9: Mar: 1704 for W^m Mitchell
on the So: Side So. River at Mitchells Chance
Poss^r David Mackintosh Rent —.. —.. 9

Clark of the Council

190 A: Sur: 10th 9ber 1701 for Rich^d Clark
on the North side the No: Bra: of Puttuxent
joyning to Champs Adventure Rent —.. 7.. 7
Poss^r Henry Hall

MIDDLE NECK HUNDRED 1707.

Smith's Neck

600 A: Sur: 21: June 1650 for Zephemiah
Smith near South River—This was Res^d the
8th May 1684 for Ann Owen & was found to
contain but 315A: Rent —.. 6.. 3¾
Poss^r Nicholas Sporne of Prin: Geo. Co. tenant
to Owens Orp^{ns}

Howard

650 A: Sur: 3^d July 1650 for Matthew How-
ard on the South side of Severn River R. —.. 13.. —

*C. I do not find This land was ever patented, but y^e Sur-
vey Supposed to be alter'd by Howard into others.*

Crouchfield

150 A: Sur: 11th Xber 1650 for W^m Crouch on
the North side of Seavern River Rent —.. 3.. —
Poss^{rs} Rich^d & Alex^r Warfeild for the Orp^{ns}
of John Howard

Todd

100 A: Sur: 8th July 1651 for Thomas Todd on
the South Side of Seavern River Rent —.. —.. —
This is pt of Annapolis Town & part the liber-
tys begins at the N. E. point of the Town &

extends along the River to the first Creek to the west & then with back lines to the beginning

Locust Neck

100 A: Sur: 22. Nov: 1651 for James Horner on the South side of Seavern Rent —.. 2.. —

C. This passed by Tho Brown by y^e name of Inheritance as supposed.

Smith

100 A: Sur: 27: Nov: 1651 for Zephaniah Smith joyning to a peell of Land called Smith's Neck This Land Res^d for Ann Owen the 8 of May 1684 & then found to be but 70 A. Rent —.. 1.. 5
Poss^r Nich^o Sporne of Prin: Geo: Co: for Owens Orp:

Wyat

90 A: Sur: 22th Nov^r 1651 for Nich: Wyatt on the North side of Severn River (that's a Mistake for the Land is on the South Side S^d River) —.. 1.. 9¹/₄
Poss^r Sam: Dorsey

Acton

100 A: Sur: 15 Nov. 1651 for Rich^d Acton near Seavern River Rent —.. 2.. —
Poss^r Sam: Norwood

Porters Hills

200 A: Sur: 20: Nov. 1651 for Peter Porter on the South side of Seavern River Rent —.. 4.. —
Poss^r Tho. Tolly by his Marriage with Kath: Howard widow of Sam: Howard

Baldwins Neck

260 A: Sur: 7th Jan^{ry} 1661 for John Baldwin on the North side of South River Rent —.. 5.. 3
Poss^r John Baldwin the son

Lydias Rest

400 A: Sur: 24th Octobr 1652 for W^m Har-
 Oattly on the No: side of South River. This
 Land was Res^d by John Baldwin the 27th May
 1681 & then found to be but 210 A Rent —. 4. 21½
 Poss^r Antho: Ruly

Beard's Dock

250 A: Sur: 15: Aug. 1650 for Rich^d Beard
 on the no: side South River Rent —. 5. —
 Poss^r John Cross

Glevins

200 A: Sur: 25th Nov. 1651 for Tho:
 Howell on the South Side of Seavern River
 Poss^r Joseph Hill Rent —. 4. —

Harnes

400 A: Sur: 24th Octobr 1651 for W^m Har-
 nesses on the No. side of South River Rent —. 8. —
 Poss^{rs} 300 A. Jos. Hill for Barkers Orp^{ns}
 100 A. Jacob Lusby

Warners Neck

320 A: Sur: 20: 9ber 1651 for James Warner
 near Seavern River Rent —. 6. 5
 Poss^{rs} 200 A. . . . Lolly by Marr^a with Kath:
 widow of Sam: Howard
 120 A: Hen: Pinkney for the Opⁿ of
 ——— Phill. Howard son of the s^d Sam.
 320

Gatenby

100 A: Sur. 4 Xber 1658 for Tho: Gates on the
 South Side of Seavern River Rent —. 2. —
 This Land was Escheated to His Lord^p for want
 of heirs of & sold by his
 Lo^p to Mr W^m Bladen who is the present Poss^r

Norwood

230 A: Sur: 3: Nov. 1658 for John Norwood
 on the So: side of Seavern River Rent —.. 4.. 8½
 Poss^r Andrew Welplay for Norwood.

Intack

100 A: Sur: 26 Aug. 1659 for John Norwood
 on the So: side Seavern on the West side of
 Dorsey's Creek Rent —.. 2.. —
 Poss^r And^w Welplay for Norwood

Norwoods Fancy

420 A: Sur: 27th Aug^t 1659 for John Norwood
 on the So: side Seavern R: on the West side the
 Round bay Rent —.. 8.. 5
 Poss^r 210 W^m Yeildhall
 210 Edw^d Hall

 420

Clink

100 A: Sur: 27: Aug: 1659 for W^m Galloway
 on the So: Side Seavern River Rent —.. 2.. —
 Poss^r Tho: Brown

Comb

150 A: Sur: 28: Aug: 1659 for Tobias Butler
 This Land lyes at the head of South River & is
 pretended to be in Elder Surveys but I beleve
 the same is Escheatable to his Lo^p for want
 of Heirs of Butler, it lyes near Freemans Neck
 which belongs to Gather & possess^d by Fran:
 Hardesty, this Land at psent is claimed by noe
 person.

Nelson

100 A: Sur: 28th Aug^t 1659 for Neal Clark on
 the East Side South River Rent —.. 2.. —
 Poss^r Tho: Reynolds

Saughier

250 A: Sur: 23^d: Sept: 1650 for George Saughier near Durands Creek. I doe not find that ever Saughier Alien^a this Land nor does any one claim it & it lying in the same place with Georgeston Ente^d in 58 I question if it be not the same Land tho not the quantity.

Broome

220 A: Sur: 30th Aug: 1659 for Rich^d Beard on the North Side of So: River on the West side of bro^d Creek. this was again Sur: 31 Octob 1670 & Ass^d Coll. Hen. Ridgly
Poss^r Coll Hen: Ridgly of Prin: Geo: Co: for Hen: Ridglys Orp^{ns}

—.. 4.. 5

Brampton

100 A: Sur: 30: Aug: 1659 for R^d: Beard on the North side South River on the East side bro^d Creek
Poss^r John Maccubbin

Rent —.. 2.. —

Brownly

150 A: Sur: 4th Sept: 1659 for Tho: Brown near the head of Seavern River on the West side
Poss^r Tho: Browne

Rent —.. 3.. —

Cosill alias Brushy Neck

200 A: Sur: 2d Nov. 1659 for John Collier on the South side of Todds Creek on the South side Seavern River. This Land was Res^d by Tho: Francis the 7th Octob. 1683 for 390 A: by the name of Brushy Neck & after for Sam: Young the 28th Octob. 1699 for 200 A: & soe confirmed
Poss^r Sam: Young.

Rent —.. 4.. —

Georgetown

190 A: Sur: 3^d Sept. 1659 for George Saughier
 near Durands Creek Rent —.. 3.. 10½
 Poss^r Rob: Lusby.

Withers Durand

250 A: Sur: 16: Xber 1661 for Sam: Withers
 on the South Side Seavern River near Howells
 Creek —.. 3.. —
 Poss^r 200 A: W^m Bladen
 50 A: Edw^d Moore

250

Richardson's Folly

200 A: Sur: 19: Jan^{ry} 1661 for Laurence
 Richardson on the So: Side of Seavern River
 near Round bay. Rent —.. 4.. —
 Poss^{rs} 100 A: Tho: Bland
 100 A: John Rockhold

200

Covells Cove

430 A: Sur: 16: Feb: 1661 for Ann Covell on
 the North side South River joyning to Nelson
 Rent —.. 8.. 7¼
 Poss^{rs} 300 A: Ann Lamberts Ex^{rs}
 80 A: Sam Whitter
 50 A: John Ingram for Robinson's

430 Orphans.

Hogg Neck

250 A: Sur: 18th Feb. 1661 for Edw^d Hope on
 the North side South River Rent —.. 5.. —
 Poss^r Charles Ridgely

Wardrap

200 A: Sur: for James Warn^r 20th Feb: 1661
 on the No: side South River on the east side of
 Broad Creek Rent —.. 4.. —
 Poss^r Moses Maccubins

Wardridge

600 A: Sur: 20th Feb. 1661 for James Warner
 & Henry Ridgly on the No: side So: Riv^r Rent —.. 12.. —
 Poss^r 200 A: Coll. Hen: Ridgly
 200 A: d^o for his son Hen^s: Orp^{ns}
 200 A: Charles Ridgly

600

West Quarter

100 A: Sur: 17: Mar: 1661 for Jacob Brem-
 ington on the So: side of Seavern Riv^r on the
 North side Howell Creek Rent —.. 2.. —
 Poss^r Joseph Hill

Adventure

50 A: Sur: 15th Sp: 1663 for W^m Frizell on
 the North side So: River at the bounds of
 Nich^o Wyat Rent —.. 1.. —
 Poss^r Coll Hen: Ridglys Orphans

Landing Place

50 A: Sur: 15 April 1663 for Neal Clark on
 the North side of So: River joyning to Nelson —.. 1.. —
 Poss^r Tho: Reynolds

Turkey Quarter

150 A: Sur: 15: April 1663 for Neal Clark
 on the No: side of the head of So: River be-
 tween the Land of James Warner & Nich^o Wyat
 Rent —.. 3.. —
 Poss^r Neal Clark

Hambleton

350 A: Sur: 27: Octob. 1662 for Edward Skidmore on the North side South River at a marked Pine in the mouth of Maccubins Cove
Poss^r Samuell Young

Rent —.. 7.. —

Wyats Ridge

450 A: Sur: 16: Decemb. 1662 for Nicholas Wyat between the Bra: of South River & the main Bra: of Broad Creek

Rent —.. 9.. —

Poss^r 225 A: Samuell Dorsey

225 Coll. Hen: Ridgely for his

— son Henry's Orphan's

450

Todds Range

120 A: Sur: 18: Xber 1662 for Tho: Todd on the South Side Severn River

Rent —.. 2.. 5

Poss^{rs} 100 A: Samuel Norwood

20 A: Town of Annapolis Comon

120

Howards Heirship

420 A: Sur: 26: Jan^{ry} 1662 for Cornelius Howard on the South Side Seavern Riv^r at the head of Hockly Creek

Rent —.. 8.. 5

Poss^{rs} 300 A: Caleb Dorsey

64 A: Joseph Howard

60 A: Cornelius Howard

124

4 A: over the Survey —.. —.. 1

Howards Hope

100 A: Sur: 26: Jan^{ry} 1662 for Samuell Howard on the South Side of Severne Riv^r

—.. 2.. —

Poss^r Joseph Howard

Howard's Interest

180 A: Sur: 28th Jan^{ry} 1662 for John Howard
on the South Side of Severne River Rent —.. 3.. —
Poss^r John Dorsey son of Joshua Dor:

Charles's Hills

200 A: Sur: 27th Jan^{ry} 1662 for Charles
Stephens on the South side Severn Riv^r on the
North side Mountain Neck Rent —.. 4.. —
Poss^r Cornelius Howard

Withers Outlett

100 A. Sur: 4: Mar: 1662 for Samuelt Withers
on the South Side Severne River on the West
side ferry Creek Rent —.. 2.. —
Poss^r Joseph Hill

Smith's Rest

150 A: Sur: 5: Mar: 1662 for Walter Smith
on the North Side South River. 50 A: p^t of
this is in possession of Jacob Lusby and the re-
maining 100 A: in possessⁿ of John Davidge
who the Res^d
the same & found to contain 121 A: by the
name of Dabidges Meadows the whole now is
171 A. at Rent —.. 3.. 5¼

Edwards Neck

100 A: Sur: 5th Mar: 1662 for John Edwards
on the north side South River at a point at
the mouth of Fishing Creek —.. 2.. —
Poss^r Anthony Ruly

Wardrop Ridge

100 A: Sur: 12 Octob 1663 for Patrick Dunkin
on the north side South River respecting the
Land called Wardrop to the West. This Land
was Res^d for s^d Dunkin 1st June 1676 at the
rent of —.. 4.. —

Escheated to his LoP for want of Heirs
of . . . & granted the . . . to M^r Cha: Car-
roll who is the psent poss^r

Woodyard

150 A: 15th Octob 1663 Sur: for John
Howard & Char: Stephens near the round bay
on the So: side Severne River 400 A: of this —.. 2.. —
Land is in possessⁿ of Sam: Norwood the rem^a
50 A. is res^d into a tract of Land called Good
Mothers endeavour entred in page 79 & the s^d
100 A: now only und^r this name

Salmons Hill

100 A: Sur: 26: Octob 1663 for Ralph Salmon
at the head of Plumb Creek on the south side
of South River Rent —.. 2.. —
Poss^{rs} 50 A: Ruth Howard
50 A: Guy Meek

100

James's Hill

100 A: Sur: 21: June 1663 for John James
on the south side Severne River joyning to the
Land of Samuell Withers Rent —.. 2.. —
Poss^r William Bladen

Chance

100 A: Sur: 12th Octob. 1663 for W^m Frezill
on the North side South River on the East
side green ginger Creek Rent —.. 2.. —
Poss^r Thomas Rutland

Hope

100 A: Sur: 15th Octob 1663 for Henry Sewell
on the South Side Severne River about a mile
from the head of Plumb Creek R. —.. 2.. —
Poss^r Rich^d Warfeild

Wyat's Hill

60 A: Sur: 16: Octob 1663 for Nich^o Wyatt
 on the South side Severne River Rent —.. 1.. 2½
 Poss^r Edw^d Dorsey

The Landing

100 A: Sur: 20th Octo: 1663 for Tho: Under-
 wood on the North side Severne at the head
 of Ferry Creek Rent —.. 2.. —
 Poss^r Thomas Cockey from James Anford & he
 from Thomas Underwood but I doubt the
 sale from Anford, he left noe heir

Wayfeild

100 A: Sur: 21 Octob 1663 for Nich^o Wyatt
 on the South side Severn River in the woods —.. 2.. —
 Poss^r Rich^d Warfeild

Bear Ridge

175 A: Sur: 12: Octob 1663 for Nich^o Wyatt
 on the South side Severne River Rent —.. 3.. 6
 Poss^r Josua Dorsey

JOHN HENRY ALEXANDER, LL. D.

(1812-1867)

First Geologist of the State of Maryland.

HENRY J. BERKLEY

Bishop Pinkney, in his funeral eulogy on John Henry Alexander likens him to the Admirable James Crichton, and from several view points this statement can hardly be considered an exaggeration. Both had in many ways the same distinguishing talents; the use of many languages, of great originality in reasoning powers, of being poets, and in versatility; but of the

two Alexander was the more stable, of deeper reading, and more skilled in theology and mathematics, than his compeer. As a son of this State he stands in the front rank of those who have been born within its confines, and in versatility no one has nearly approached him. Yet, this man who died only sixty years ago, is quite forgotten, and his grave untended.

Dr. Alexander was born in the town of Annapolis, in the year 1812; the son of William Alexander (1765-1822), and Mary Harwood Stockett (1771-1827). The father came to Annapolis from Belfast, Ireland (probably belonging to the general clan of Scotch Alexanders), when a youth, and soon became a substantial citizen, marrying, shortly, Miss Stockett of the Ann Arundel family of that name.

Dr. Alexander was the youngest of the four children of these parents, his next brother being Thomas Stockett, the talented chancery lawyer. Dr. Alexander entered St. John's College at the age of 12 years, and graduated from it two years later. He then came to Baltimore to study Civil Engineering and Law. The record of his early life in this town is rather vague. He seems to have spent his days in poring over books on leveling and surveying, then geology, which he varied for a month by becoming "a maker of bricks in a brickyard." In 1834 he emerged from this obscurity by issuing, as editor, a volume of Sims Treatise on Mathematical Instruments used in Surveying, Leveling and Astronomy, which went through three editions. Next, we find him as principal engineer in the survey of the Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad (1837), a piece of work that still stands to his memory in the present Northern Central Railway. He was soon thereafter in the employ of the United States Government, in the Coast Survey and in the Philadelphia Mint, then as topographical surveyor and Geologist of this State, again a professor in the Universities of Maryland and Pennsylvania, and at times he taught the students of St. James College, Hagerstown.

As State Geologist, he rode and tramped the hill country of

the Western part of the State, and that his rides were lonely, and protection needed, is shown by the heavy pistols now in possession of the Maryland Historical Society.

Dr. Alexander spoke, wrote and read seven different languages, using Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, French and English coequally. It is impossible from present data, to date his entrance into his many avocations. At an early period of his career he became State Surveyor; then State Geologist. To him, more than to any other single individual is due the honor of laying the foundation of the great coal industry of Western Maryland. He mapped out the veins of the richest and most productive of the coal measures, especially those of the George's Creek Region, and was instrumental in their opening, after the penetration by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad into this locality, made transportation of the product possible.

In addition to these many business duties, he became a profound theologian, versed in the law as well as the parliamentary aspects, and stood high as a layman in the Councils of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, both in its local and general conventions. From the German of Martin Luther he translated the most acceptable hymns, and himself wrote hymns, sonnets and introits. Several of the manuscripts of his religious books have the titles illuminated in colors as were those of the 14th century. As a poet he may rank among the very highest this State has produced.

In 1857, he was appointed by the President Commissioner to England to arrange for an uniform system of weights and measures between these countries, and to the same realm he was Commissioner on international coinage. A set of his weights and measures, the first and last standard for Maryland, has been recently presented to the Maryland Historical Society, and stands in one of the entry halls. A short time before his death he was appointed Commissioner to the Paris Exposition of 1867. He is said to have prepared his passports in seven different languages.

In personal appearance, Dr. Alexander is described as being "Tall, finely formed, erect, and easy in his motions, a man to be observed." He died of typhoid fever on March 2nd, 1867. At his request, midnight services were held at St. Luke's P. E. Church by his college chum, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Pinkney, and the body was carried by footmen to St. Paul's Burying Ground, and there interred, in the midst of a pelting hail storm, according to the solemn ritual of the church. His grave and tombstone are now entirely neglected.

The bishop characterizes his friend as a "profound mathematician, a poet of unusual ability, a ripe and varied scholar, a laborious and successful writer, and a punctual man of business." Mr. J. G. Proud, a vestryman of St. Luke's Church, and a close associate of his throughout life, in a long forgotten biography (1868), writes;—"he was, probably, the most remarkable of the sons of our alma mater. As a man of science, as a linguist, as a scholar of varied and profound attainments, he was unquestionably without a peer among them. Indeed, in these respects it is no exaggeration to rank him among the foremost men of his day."

The following is an incomplete list of Dr Alexander's works: 1, Editor, with copious additions, of Sims Treatise on Mathematical Instruments, used in Surveying, Leveling and Astronomy. This work ran through three editions. Balto., 1835, 1839, 1848. 2, As Editor: A treatise on Leveling; Balto. 1838. 3, A Contribution to an History of the Metallurgy of Iron; a complicated work, giving the history of iron working through the ages. There is added to it a list and history of all the early iron furnaces of Maryland. Pp. 264. Balto. 1840. 4, Part two, of the same, Balto. 1842. 5, A report of the Standard of Weights and Measures for the State of Maryland. Pp. 213; also Greek, Roman and Saracen measures. Balto. 1854. 6, An Universal Dictionary of Weights and Measures. A painstaking and complicated book. Balto. 1857. 7, A treatise on the English system of weights and measures; Pp. 158, Oxford,

1857. A new map of Maryland (Topographical), Annapolis, 1838-1840. 9, *Catena Dominica*, Phila. 1857. 2nd N. Y. 1867. 10, A treatise on Burbage's Method of Distinguishing Lighthouses. Washington, 1861. 11, A treatise on the International Coinage of Great Britain and the United States. Oxford, 1857. 12, An Opinion on a location of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in Wheeling, West Virginia, Balto. 1850. 13, A Dictionary of English Surnames, 1850 (this work was interrupted by death; the earlier volumes were published at Oxford, but the later ones remained in manuscript and were lost), Vols. XII. 14, *Ancient Roman Surnames*; 1 vol. Oxford, 1852. 15, *Greek Onomatology*, 1 vol. Oxford, 1853. 16, A Dictionary of the Language of the Lenni-Lenape Indians (also interrupted by death). 17, A Concordance and Analytical Index of the Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopal Church. 1 vol. Phila. 1857. 18, A Handy Book of Parliamentary Practice. 1 vol. Phila. 1858. 19, *Hymns of Martin Luther*, Translated into English with notes, 1 vol. 1860. 20, *Suspiria Sanctorum*, or Sonnets for Holy Days. 1 vol. Phila. 1862. 21, *In troitus, sive Psalmi Davidei*. 1 vol. Phila. 1844.

The scientific treatises in the journals of England, Germany and America are too numerous to mention, and mainly bear on his surveying and geological work.

A partial list of the scientific societies of which Dr. Alexander was a member is as follows:—Fellow American Philosophical Society; Member of the National Institute; Collaborator of the Smithsonian Institute; Member of the Geographical and Statist Society; Member of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Historical Societies; Professor of Civil Engineering in the University of Pennsylvania; Professor of Physics in the University of Maryland; Topographical Engineer and Geologist of the State of Maryland; Consulting Engineer of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad; Engineer of the United States Coast Survey; Commissioner to England on a Standard of Weights and Measures; and Commissioner to the same Country on International Coinage.

A few examples of Dr. Alexander's poetry are given below, taken from his *Catena Dominica*, the best known of his poetical works. The first two verses are from the prologue.

One evening, as the mellow sunlight slept
Upon the sward and dyed it green and gold,
While overhead the leaves a murmur kept
And whispered what the oriole had told
His mate, or what the thrush or blue bird bold
Had carolled to them, in the early day,
Of the far distant ether, clear and cold,—
Beside an ancient, haunted elm I lay,
With roving thoughts unsteady as yon quivering spray.

Bathed in this lustre, then awhile grew dim
The actual scene that close around me lay;
Unheard the mocking bird's wild varied hymn
That fitful swelled and sank, now grave, now gay;
Unmarked, the graces of the tremblous spray,
Of melting colors, blending earth and sky;
—I only heeded the sweet, linked display
Of that so luminous chain which seemed to lie
Overarching, in its span, the azure canopy.

From "The Valet":—

The strain has ceased; and many an eve,
Since it was sung, has stolen nigh
The elm, where fancies came to weave
Their rude, unlabored tapestry;

Like one's old footprints on the beach,
The wasting tide has failed to reach.

O stealing eve, O haunted tree,
Would you have borne or less or more to me

From "The heart knoweth its own bitterness":—

The dimpling smile on Beauty's cheek,
The brow so calm and fair,
Pledge not within the peace we seek,
Hide not its secret there.

And so, amid some pageant high,
Some hour of glorious sheen,
The form elate, the flashing eye
Mask woeful hearts, I ween.

No age, no rank, no toil, no love
Evades this destiny;
But each created heart must prove
Its lonely malady.

EARLIEST RECORDS OF BALTIMORE COUNTY.

CONTRIBUTED BY LOUIS DOW SCISCO.

The first two record books of Baltimore County are probably non-existent. One may not be too certain of it, for there is a storage room in the court house that is piled high with masses of old records and no man knows what may or may not lie within its close-set heaps. However, it is a long way from 1659 to 1929, and there is very little likelihood that these oldest books will ever again be seen.

The County of Baltimore was created probably by a proclamation in December, 1659, from Governor Fendall, following his own precedent in creating Charles County by proclamation in 1658. There is nothing in the council register in the way of record of the act creating the county. It is recorded that on December 12, 1659, the governor and council ordered election writs sent to the several counties for representatives in the coming general assembly, and that when these writs were issued on January 12, 1660, one of them went to Baltimore County, then mentioned for the first time. Organization of the new county took place, presumably, in January or February, 1660, for an election was held and the county burgesses appeared in the general assembly on February 28, 1660.

From February, 1660, to June, 1661, there are occasional entries in the provincial records showing that the county court and officials were duly functioning. Necessarily there was a record book of court proceedings for the period, but of this first county book no known trace now exists, either in substance or in excerpt. Governor Fendall, creator of the county,

allied himself with the colonial party that sought to throw off proprietary rule and was swept out of office when the proprietor's authority was restored late in 1660. On June 16, 1661, Governor Philip Calvert issued a new commission to the Baltimore County court, which reorganized thereunder on July 20, 1661, with John Collett as clerk.

With the session of the new court was begun a new record book which, although it has disappeared, is known today by a series of excerpts from it which were copied in 1729 from the original book and now occupy pages 1 to 13 of an existing book bearing the curious title R. M. No. H. S. The copyists of 1729 were thoughtful enough to append to each excerpt the title of the original book and the folio from which the excerpt was taken. From these notations it appears that the book was called Liber OLL. Very possibly "OLL" was all that remained in 1729 from a former label that bore the name "COLLETT." That, however, is a mere guess. More certain it is that the original book was of slight thickness, for the copyists made no excerpts after its folio 61. In the original record book were the court minutes from July, 1661, to September, 1665. The copyists were concerned only with entries that related to land ownership. Of court trials and orders they preserved nothing. Three of the introductory headings of session minutes were copied and aid in fixing the chronology of the excerpts, but the actual dates of some of the entries are very uncertain.

The following summary of the excerpts contains all the names and dates therein. Figures in parentheses at the close of each item indicate the pages of the original Liber OLL. Words in brackets are supplied by the present compiler, and those which state the time of recording must be considered as more or less tentative.

[The following were entered apparently at session of July, 1661.]

Clerk's minute that court session is held on July 20, 1661, at the house of Capt. Thomas Howell, commissioners present being Capt. Thomas Howell, Capt. Thomas Stockett, Mr. Henry Stockett, Mr. Thomas Powell, and Mr. John Taylor. (3)

Acknowledgement of assignment, June 22, 1661, by which Mr. Godfrey Bayley has conveyed to Mr. Nathaniel Stiles, merchant, the tract "Bayley" of 300 acres, location not stated. Witnesses, John Hatton, Godfrey Harman. (3)

Acknowledgment of assignment, November 10, 1660, by which Marcus Severson conveyed to Abraham Coston* the tract "Markefield" of 100 acres, at Sassafras River. Witnesses, Thomas Ho[well], Godfrey Bayley. (3)

Acknowledgement of assignment, November 10, 1660, by which Peter Jacobson has conveyed to Marcus Severson 50 acres of the 200-acre tract "[Peter]field," which 50 acres [Severson] has conveyed to Abraham [Coston]. Witnesses, Capt. Thomas Howell, [Godfrey Bayley]. Notation says original entry was defective in 1729 when copied. (3)

Acknowledgement of assignment, [November 10, 1660], by which Peter Jacobson has conveyed to [Marcus] Severson 75 acres of the 200-acre tract "———." Witnesses, Thomas Howell, Godfrey Bayley. Original entry was defective in 1729 when copied. (3)

[The following were entered probably at session in October, 1662.]

Minute of acknowledgement at court that Thomas Goldsmith, by assignment on the back of a patent, has conveyed to Col. Edward Carter of Nancemum, Va., the remainder of the tract "Planter's Delight," location not stated, before witnesses George Goldsmith, Francis Stockett, James Frisby. (13)

Minute of acknowledgement at court, October 20, 1662, that Capt. Thomas Howell and wife Elizabeth have conveyed to Mr. Nathaniel Stiles, merchant, all except 50 acres of the tract "Sutton Underhill," location not stated. (13)

Warranty deed, October 9, 1662, by which John Collett conveys to Edward Carter of Nancemum, Va., for 1,000 pounds of tobacco, a tract laid out for 200 acres, on the south side of Steelpone Bay, Eastern Shore, being bounded west by a marked sycamore and east by Charne Creek. Witnesses, Thomas Howell, George Goldsmith, Henry Moore. Clerk John Collett certifies. (14)

[The following were entered probably at session in March, 1662-63.]

Minute of acknowledgement at court that Mr. Godfrey Bayley, with his wife's consent, has assigned to Mr. William Fisher the tract "Cornchaston," of 100 acres on Sassafras River, before witnesses Robert Neane, John Milette. (16)

Warranty deed, October 20, 16—, by which Walter Dickenson conveys to Abraham Clarke, shipwright, 450 acres on Spring Neck on the north side of Patapsco River. Witnesses, Howell Powell, Thomas Powell. Clerk John Collett certifies. (20)

Warranty deed, March 2, 1662-63, by which John Collett conveys to

* Some five years later it is recorded that Abraham Coffen and wife conveyed Markefield and Peterfield to John Gilbert.

Abraham Clarke the tract "Nashes Rest," laid out for 200 acres, at Beare Creek, on the north side of Patapsco River. Witnesses, Samuel Collett, Thomas Muntross. Clerk John Collett certifies. (21)

[The following were entered probably at session in November, 1663.]

Assignment, March 18, 1661-62, by which Mr. Oliver Sprye conveys to Mr. John Collier the tract "Uppe Ollies," location not stated. Witnesses, William Hollis, Mary Harman. (29)

Assignment, August 17, 1663, by which Walter Dickeson conveys to Richard Bale the tract "Gunworth," location not stated. Witnesses, Howell Powell, William Bale. (30)

Assignment, June 20, 1663, by which Mr. Oliver Sprye, in presence of the whole court, conveys to his daughter Mary, wife of Godfrey Harmer, and heirs of her body, the tract "Sampson," location not stated. Clerk John Collett certifies. (30)

Warranty deed, June 28, 1659, by which Walter Dickeson conveys to Thomas Powell of Corotomon, Lancaster County, Va., the tract "Roade River" in Patapsco, of 287½ acres, it being half of 575 acres bought from William Batten, merchant. Witnesses, Howell Powell, Richard Gorsuch. Clerk John Collett certifies. (31)

Deed, March 14, 1661-62, by which Richard Gorsuch conveys to Thomas Powell a tract on the north side of Patapsco River, beginning at an easternmost marked tree and extending westerly along the river to the western side of the next valley, this tract being part of 300 acres surveyed in 1659 for Gorsuch by Robert Clarke. Witnesses, Howell Powell, Richard Cardings. Clerk John Collett certifies. (32)

Assignment, June 11, 1663, by which Mr. John Collier and wife Ann convey to Mr. John Bruer the tract "Collier," location not stated. Witnesses, Nathaniel Stiles, William Hollis. Clerk John Collett certifies. (33)

[The following was entered probably at session in March, 1663-64.]

Acknowledgement of assignment, March 10, 1663-64, by which William Orchard has conveyed to Mr. James Browne the tract "Orchard's Neck," of 150 acres, location not stated. Witness, Thomas Stockett. (39)

[The following were entered probably at session in September, 1664.]

Warranty deed, June 28, 1659, by which Walter Dickeson conveys to Thomas Powell 287½ acres is recorded a second time. (44) By appendant assignment, December 10, 1663, Thomas Powell conveys his interest to Lawrence Porter and Philip Jones. Witnesses, John Collett, John Dickeson. Clerk John Collett certifies. (44)

Assignment, October 30, 1663, by which Walter Dickenson of Patapsco conveys to Daniel Jones the tract "Dickenson," of 420 acres, location not stated. Witnesses, Richard Thurrell, John Preston. (45)

Assignment, November 6, 1663, by which Howell Powell conveys to Philip Stevenson the tract "Powell's Neck," of 100 acres, location not stated. Witnesses, Thomas Powell, Daniel Jones. Clerk John Collett certifies. (45)

Deed of gift, March 1, 1661-62, by which Mary M. Humphreys, widow, conveys to her daughter Mary Humphreys a 300-acre plantation and a man servant, to be delivered to donee when she is 16 years old or when married, with reversion to donor if the girl dies without heirs. Witnesses, Walter Dickenson, Paul Kensey. Notation says the property is now occupied by Mr. Richard Bale, husband of Mary Humphreys. (46)

Warranty deed, March 2, 1662-63, by which John Collett conveys to Abraham Clarke 200 acres is recorded a second time. (47) By appendant assignment, March 7, 1662-63, Abraham Clarke, shipwright, conveys interest to Thomas Muntross. Witnesses, Edward Forster, Joseph Forster. (48) By appendant assignment, April 13, 1664, Thomas Muntross conveys interest to John Robinson of Mockjack Bay, Va., Witnesses, Abraham Clarke, Joseph Chissell. (48) By appendant assignment, April 23, 1664, John Robinson conveys interest to Nicholas Rackston of Mockjack Bay, Va. Witnesses, Philip Stevens[on], James Kensey, Robert Baddle. (48)

Bond, August 10, 1662, by which Gerrit Wayts of Gloucester County, Va., mortgages to Thomas Powell his land on North Point of Patapsco River to secure payment of 12,400 pounds of tobacco and one anker of sack or drames. Witnesses, Howell Powell, William Lewis. Clerk John Collett certifies. (49)

Bill of debt, November 8, 1662, by which Gerrit Wayts agrees to pay Thomas Powell at North Point of Patapsco River, 5,000 pounds of tobacco. Witnesses, Howell Powell, Lawrence Porter, Philip Jones. (50)

Bill of debt, November 8, 1662, by which Gerrit Wayts agrees to pay Thomas Powell, at North Point of Patapsco River, three cows with calves, one heifer, and 1,000 single ten nails. Witnesses, Howell Powell, Lawrence Porter, Philip Jones. (50)

Bill of debt, August 10, 1662, by which Gerrit Wayts of Gloucester County, Va., agrees to deliver to Thomas Powell at Patapsco River one servant aged 14 to 20 years. Witnesses, Howell Powell, William Lewis. (50)

Assignment, August 10, 1662, by which Howell Powell conveys to William Lewis an undescribed patent tract, except 40 or 50 acres on its lower side which perhaps are covered by a prior patent. Witnesses, Gerrit Weyts, Richard Gorsuch. (51) By appendant assignment, November 24, 1663, William Lewis conveys interest to Richard Carter. Witnesses, George Seatoune, Anthony Webb. (51)

Letter of attorney, March 24, 1663-64, by which William Lewis and wife Constant authorize John Guyn to obtain from Howell Powell acknowledgement of conveyance of 300 acres at Patapsco River which Lewis has sold to Mr. Richard Carter. Witnesses, George Seatoune, Samuel Luke. (51)

[The following were entered probably at session in July, 1664.]

Assignment, July 20, 1664, by which Philip Stevenson conveys to Richard Hensworth his interest in a patent tract not described. Witnesses, Thomas Powell, Charles Gorsuch. (52)

Assignment, February 5, 1663-64, by which Paul Kinsey conveys to William Guyn his interest in a patent tract not described. Katherine Kinsey is co-assignor by signature. Witnesses, William Towers, Richard Thurell. (52)

[The following was entered probably at session in November, 1664.]

Contract, November 7, 1664, by which John Collett agrees with Hendrick Enlos and John Alkmore for sale of tract "Elk Neck," of 300 acres, at Gunpowder River, for 3,500 pounds of tobacco, said tract being covered by patent of ——— 19, 1664. Witnesses, Nathaniel Stiles, John Taylor. Clerk John Collett certifies. (56-57)

[The following were entered apparently at session of August, 1665.]

Clerk's minute that court session is held on August 8, 1665, commissioners present being Capt. Thomas Stockett, Mr. Henry Stockett, Mr. George Goldsmith, Mr. George Utie, Mr. Nathaniel Stiles, Mr. John Taylor, and Mr. John Dickson. (60)

Minute of acknowledgement that Daniel Jones has sold to Mr. John Dickson a tract, location not stated. (60)

Minute of acknowledgement that John Collett has sold to Thomas Skellton a tract, location not stated. (60)

Minute of acknowledgement that Richard Collett has sold to his brother John Collett his interest in their jointly owned land, location not stated. (60)

Minute of acknowledgement that John Collett has sold to Mr. John Hawkins a tract owned by Richard and John Collett. (60)

[The following were entered apparently at session of September, 1665.]

Clerk's minute that court session is held on September 13, 1665, commissioners present being Capt. Thomas Stockett, Mr. George Utie, Mr. George Goldsmith, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. Godfrey Bayley, Mr. Augustine Harman, Capt. John Collier, and Mr. Richard Bale. (61)

Minute of acknowledgement that Mathias DeCost has sold to Thomas Ireton 700 acres, location not stated. (61)

ABORIGINAL MARYLAND, 1608-1689.

IN TWO PARTS

PART ONE: THE EASTERN SHORE

By RAPHAEL SEMMES, LL. B., PH. D.

Not long ago descendants of the Nanticoke Indians held a conference in the State of Delaware. The meeting awakened memories of a now almost vanished race which once made their home on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. What a different scene three hundred years ago. Our woods, our rivers, and our great bay belonged to the Indians. No whites disturbed the Indian as he hunted and fished, or molested him at home in his village along one of our river banks. The supremacy of the red man was as yet unchallenged.

Where were the settlements of the "Maryland Indians" on the eastern shore and also on the western shore before the arrival of the Maryland colonists? For this let Captain John Smith, Henry Fleet and John Pory answer. After the Maryland colonists arrived, did they find the Indians similarly located? For this the Calvert Papers, the Archives, the early Jesuit priests and settlers can answer. Lastly, what were the number of Indians living in Maryland in the early part of the seventeenth century? For this we can consult both explorer's accounts and colonial sources.

It is interesting to see how far the colonial records substantiate Captain John Smith.¹ In this description of Aboriginal

¹ Dr. Philip Alexander Bruce consulted Smith's Works in his study of the location of Indian tribes in Virginia. (See Dr. Bruce's *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, 1896, Vol. I, pp. 140-144.) *The Handbook of American Indians*, edited by Frederick W. Hodge, 1907, 1910, and published by the Bureau of American Ethnology, also contains numerous references to Smith. For the details of the pro- and anti-Smith controversy see bibliographical note in Edward Channing's *History of the United States*, Vol. I, p. 174, 1926 edition.

Maryland, our estimate of the Indian population will be based on Smith's Works.² To obtain this estimate the number of Indian inhabitants of each tribe or village mentioned by Smith in his text is added together. Captain Smith generally spoke of an Indian village as containing so many men or warriors. From one account, we know that Smith considered the proportion of fighting men to the rest of the Indian inhabitants as one warrior to approximately three people.³ Accordingly, one hundred men or warriors would signify a total Indian population of about three hundred. In one instance, and in one instance only, Smith leads us to believe that his ratio was as much as one to ten. It is when he is describing the number of Indians along the banks of the Cuskarawaok (Nanticoke), river, that Smith refers to "two or three thousand men, women and children."⁴ Later when mentioning the same Indian settlements, Smith states that there were "200 men."⁵ This would go to show that Smith's ratio was one to ten. In this article, however, the ratio of one to three has been applied where Smith gives the number of men or warriors.⁶ In determining the Indian population of early seventeenth century Maryland, it will be seen that the latter ratio of one to three will give a more reasonable result than would the one to ten ratio.

In order to locate the Indian settlements on the eastern shore in the early part of the seventeenth century, the territory just north of the Pocomoke river will first be considered. The shore line of the Chesapeake, including its tributary rivers, will then be followed north to the Susquehanna river and Indian villages and tribes in the intervening territory noted. In a sub-

² *Works of Captain John Smith*, edited by E. Arber, 1884. Bozman's comments on passages from Smith are especially valuable. (John Leeds Bozman, *History of Maryland*, 2 volumes, 1837.)

³ *Smith's Works*, p. 360.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 415; Bozman, Vol. I, pp. 110, 111. Bozman well states the reasons for identifying the Cuskarawaok river of Smith with the present Nanticoke river.

⁵ *Smith's Works*, p. 351; Bozman, Vol. I, p. 144.

⁶ Dr. Bruce uses a similar ratio. (Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia*, Vol. I, pp. 140-144.)

sequent article, the country on the western shore between the Susquehanna river and the Patuxent river will be explored. Our journey will include a trip up the Patuxent and from the Patuxent then to the Potomac of which we will follow the northern shore as far as the present site of Washington where our journey will end.

Beginning then on the eastern shore at the Pocomoke river, we find that there were at the time of Captain Smith's voyage in 1608 Indian settlements containing one hundred warriors or "men," or applying our ratio, about three hundred Indian men, women and children.⁷ These Indians lived on both banks of the Pocomoke in the present Somerset and Worcester counties, and some of them probably in what is now Accomac county of Virginia.⁸ Colonial records refer not only to the Pocomoke Indians but also to the Yingoteague and Assateague Indians. The former perhaps lived near the bay of the similar name of Chincoteague on the Atlantic seaboard. It was very likely some of the Assateague Indians that were encountered by Verrazano on his visit to Atlantic shore line of Maryland in 1524. The principal village of the Assateague tribe was called Askiminkanson. The name of the tribe was applied to a creek and bay in Worcester county near which the Assateagues lived.⁹

⁷ *Smith's Works*, pp. 351, 414, 415, (map) p. 384. As Bozman very clearly points out, the river Pocomoge was dubbed by Smith the Wigho, or Wighcocomoco. (Bozman, Vol. I, pp. 107, 108, 144.) For evidence confirming Bozman's belief, see Herman's Map of 1670 in Senate Document, Jan. 17, 1872; *Report of Va.-Md. Boundary Commissioners* and see also *Archives of Maryland*, published by Md. Hist. Soc., containing proceedings of Council, Assembly, Provincial Court, Vol. III, p. 496.

⁸ *Smith's Works*, map, p. 384; *Archives of Md.*, Vol. V, pp. 479; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 213, 236.

⁹ *Herman's Map of 1670*; *Archives*, Vol. XV, pp. 145, 213; *ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 379, 380; *ibid.*, Vol. VIII, p. 383; *Handbook of American Indian*, Part I, p. 101; Harry F. Covington, "The Discovery of Maryland; or, Verrazano's Visit to the Eastern Shore," *Md. Hist. Soc. Mag.*, Vol. X, p. 199. Assateague Creek is now called Trappe Creek and Askiminkanson is known as Indiantown (*ibid.*, pp. 214, 215). Askiminkanson was for a while the name of the present Nassawango Creek in Worcester County (*Archives*, Vol. V, p. 481).

The Assateague Indians were first hostile and then friendly to the Maryland colonists.¹⁰

The early settlers also mentioned the Marumseo Indians who lived perhaps near the present creek of that name which flows southerly through Somerset county and empties into the Pocomoke river about five miles from its mouth. The Annemesse Indians of early colonial record have a survival of their name in the Annemesse river just north of the Pocomoke. The neck of land between the Pocomoke river and the Annemesse was the site of Indian settlements as was the Manokin river which is just north of the Annemesse.¹¹

Proceeding northward we come to the Wicomico river which, though not visited by Smith, we know from colonial sources was inhabited by Indians. The Indians dwelling on this river are referred to by the colonists as the Wiccocomicos, the Wichocomocos, the Wicomeses or as the Wicomicks.¹² The chief village of these Wicomico Indians is supposed to have been on the south bank of the river in what is now Somerset county. These Indians were at one time allied with the Nanticokes, who lived just north of them, in a joint attack on the colonists.¹³

We come next to the Nanticoke river whose waters now divide Wicomico and Dorchester counties. There were about six hundred Indians, according to Smith, who lived along the banks of the Cuskawaraok as he called the Nanticoke river. Smith also noted that along this river there "doth inhabit the people of Sarapinagh, Nause, Arseek and Nantaquak, the best Marchants of all other Salvages." On his map and near the

¹⁰ *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 379, 380; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 143, 213.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 213, 246; *ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 479. Colonial records also mention the Aquintica and Nusswatax Indians as living in the vicinity of the Pocomoke river (*ibid.*).

¹² *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 74, 116, 117, 191, 379; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, p. 146. According to Lord Baltimore's Map of 1635 the Wicomese are erroneously located on the mainland just north of Kent Island (Edward B. Mathews, "The Maps and Map-Makers of Maryland," *Md. Geol Survey*, Vol. II, p. 361).

¹³ *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 116, 191; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, p. 950.

head of the same river, Smith placed a settlement which he called Kuskarawaok.¹⁴ It seems very probable that all these five names, Sarapinagh, Nause, Arseek, Nantaquak and Kuskarawaok were the designations of settlements or divisions of the Cuskarawaok or Nanticoke river Indians. Nause was located on the north bank of the Nanticoke not far from the mouth. Nantaquak and Kuskarawaok were on the same bank but farther up stream, the latter possibly on Broad creek a branch of the Nanticoke river which is in Delaware.¹⁵ The Maryland colonists applied the word "Nanticoke" with variations in the spelling, to all the Indians living on the river of the same name. Early colonial records contain no reference to Smith's settlements of Sarapinagh, Nause and Arseek. Smith's "Nantaquak" alone survived in a more inclusive sense.¹⁶ To an Indian settlement on the north bank of the Nanticoke river the Marylanders gave the name of Chicacone.¹⁷ Other Indians were reported as living on Barren creek, which then as now empties into the Nanticoke river.¹⁸ The Nanticoke Indians

¹⁴ *Smith's Works*, pp. 111, 351, 414, 415, and map, p. 384; *Bozman*, Vol. I, pp. 110, 112, 144, 154, 170, 171.

¹⁵ *Bozman*, Vol. I, pp. 110, 111; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, pp. 94, 373; *ibid.*, Part II, pp. 40, 466.

¹⁶ *Archives*, Vol. III, p. 379. Maryland records speak of the Maquantequats, the Mancantequats and the Maquamticough Indians of the Eastern Shore (*Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 87, 363; *Bozman*, Vol. II, p. 164). Possibly the Indians so called constituted a distinct Eastern Shore tribe (*Handbook American Indians*, Part I, p. 804; *ibid.*, Part II, p. 1086), but more probably the Nanticokes were thus sometimes designated (*ibid.*, Part II, p. 26).

¹⁷ *Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 236; *Herman's Map of 1670*. Other Indian settlements of the Nanticoke Indians but whose location is uncertain were Pekoinoke (*Handbook, Amer. Indians*, Part II, p. 223) and Natahquois (*ibid.*, p. 34), which latter was probably a variation for Nanticoke. Locust Necktown, on a branch of the Choptank river in Dorchester county, was another Nanticoke Indian village, but it does not appear to have been established until the eighteenth century (*Handbook, American Indians*, Part I, p. 772; F. G. Speck, *Indians of the Eastern Shore of Maryland*, published by the Eastern Shore Society, March, 1922).

¹⁸ *Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 236.

were connected "linguistically and ethnically with the Delawares and Conoys."¹⁹

That the Indians living on the Nanticoke river were as numerous as indicated by Captain John Smith is borne out by Father White's suggestion that on this river should be located one of the three outposts for the Indian fur trade, this spot being considered the best place for trade with the eastern shore.²⁰ Although expeditions were undertaken against the Nanticokes by the colonists, these Indians were generally friendly to the English settlers.²¹ At one time when the western plantations of the province and the lands of their allies the Piscattoway Indians were being devastated by the Senecas and other Iroquois tribes, the Nanticokes offered to help the colonists and their allies. The Nanticoke Indians were one of the few eastern shore tribes to boast a fort.²²

After our visit to the Nanticoke river as we return to the Chesapeake, we pass Fishing Bay on our right. At the head of this bay and on what is today called Transquaking creek, lived during early colonial times the Trasquakin Indians.²³

Although Smith apparently did not visit the Choptank river, just as we have seen he failed to explore the Wicomico river, we know, again from colonial records, that two or three hundred Indians lived along the banks of the Choptank. The colonists were generally on good terms with the Choptanks.²⁴ On several occasions tracts of land were set apart by the colonial authorities

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 403; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, pp. 24, 25; *ibid.*, Part I, p. 339; Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes of the United States*, Vol. VI, Chap. II, p. 131; *Bozman*, Vol. I, p. 112.

²⁰ *Calvert Papers*, Md. Hist. Soc. Fund Pubs., Vol. XXVIII, pp. 210, 211.

²¹ *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 197; *ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 106, 116, 117, 129, 191, 379; *ibid.*, Vol. VII, pp. 16, 339; *ibid.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 384, 526; *ibid.*, Vol. V, pp. 551, 553, 559; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 143, 145, 173.

²² *Archives*, Vol. XVII, p. 33; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 143, 361.

²³ *Archives*, Vol. III, p. 363; *ibid.*, Vol. XVII, p. 7; *Herman's Map of 1670*.

²⁴ *Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 142, 393, 394; *ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 195, 196, 200; *ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 190; *Bozman*, Vol. I, p. 115; *Herman's Map of 1670*; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, p. 291.

for the use of the Choptank and Nanticoke Indians.²⁵ The chief villages of the Choptank Indians, named after their three most important tribal chieftains, were called Ababco, Hatsawapp, and Tequassimo.

Leaving the Choptank we must return again to the Chesapeake Bay, sailing round the large promontory or peninsula which now forms a part of Talbot county. It was on this peninsula that the Monoponson Indians made their home.²⁶

We now turn north again and pass through what is now known as Prospect Bay with Kent Island on our left and the mainland on our right. On Kent Island lived the Matapeake Indians who at one time lived at Indian Spring, but who later removed to Matapax Neck in the southern part of the island.²⁷ These Indians must have suffered from the white invasion, for although Claiborne in 1631 found about one hundred of them,²⁸ by 1641 they seem to have all disappeared.²⁹

The Ozinies lived on the southern bank of the Chester river about fifteen miles from its mouth in what is now Queen Anne's county. Smith in 1608 estimated that there were about one hundred and eighty of them.³⁰

Before we reach the head of the Chesapeake, we enter the Sassafras river where according to Captain Smith lived the Tockwoghes in a "pallizadoed towne, mantelled with the barke of trees." This "towne" of about three hundred inhabitants, situated on the southern bank of the Sassafras river, in the present Kent county, was about seven miles from the mouth of

²⁵ Kilty, *The Landholder's Assistant and Land Office Guide*, pp. 351, 355.

²⁶ Lord Baltimore's Map of 1635, *Md. Geol. Survey*, Vol. II, p. 361. This map should be compared with a modern map of Maryland as in all similar cases. See also *Archives*, Vol. III, p. 363.

²⁷ George L. Davis, *The Day Star of American Freedom* (1855), pp. 45, 110; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, p. 819.

²⁸ Bernard C. Steiner, "Beginnings of Maryland, 1631-39," in *Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies*, Vol. XXI, p. 363.

²⁹ *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 98, 99.

³⁰ *Smith's Works*, p. 351, map, 384; *Bozman*, Vol. I, pp. 131, 132, 143; *Davis*, p. 111. The Ozinies appear to have been friendly with the Susquehannocks in 1633 (*Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, p. 181).

the river.³¹ It is probable that both the Tockwoghes and the Ozinies disappeared at an early period in colonial history, the former possibly being absorbed by their northern neighbors the Susquehannocks with whom they were on friendly terms. Both the Tockwoghes and the Ozinies may have been sub-tribes or divisions of the Nanticokes.³²

At the time of Smith's visit in 1608 both the Elk and the Northeast rivers appeared devoid of Indian inhabitants.³³ A closer investigation would however have revealed the Delaware Indians who were frequently referred to by the colonists under the name of the Nattwas Indians. Their home and activities were confined to the head of the bay in the present Cecil and Harford counties.³⁴ On one occasion these Mattwas Indians allied themselves with the Wicocomico Indians in an attack on the Choptank Indians. Both the Piscattoway Indians of the Potomac and the Maryland colonists solicited the aid of the Mattwas against the dreaded Senecas and other Iroquois tribes.³⁵

³¹ *Smith's Works*, pp. 351, 422; *Bozman*, Vol. I, pp. 126, 143; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, p. 770. The colonists speak of the Tetuckwogh Indians, which may have been a variation of Tockwogh (*Archives*, Vol. III, p. 363).

³² *Works of Smith*, p. 422; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, pp. 24-26, 181, 770; *Davis*, p. 111.

³³ *Bozman*, Vol. I, p. 125.

³⁴ *Archives*, Vol. XV, pp. 157, 175; *ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 153; *ibid.*, Vol. VII, pp. 381, 387, 431; *ibid.*, vol. XVII, pp. 7, 221, 223, 225, 230; *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 414.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 53, 54, 196; *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 486; *ibid.*, Vol. XIII, p. 263; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 157, 277, 278, 279. In one instance the colonists refer to the Delaware Indians as the Masquas (instead of Mattwas) Indians (*Archives*, Vol. V, p. 153). The word Masquas here should not be confused with Maques, as the latter was a Colonial designation of the Mohawks (*ibid.*, p. 254; *Handbook American Indians*, Part I, pp. 925, 386; *ibid.*, Part II, pp. 654, 655). What now constitutes the State of Delaware was really within the territory originally granted to Lord Baltimore. Hence we find the early Maryland colonists claiming jurisdiction over the Christina Indians—probably a subtribe of the Delaware Indians—who lived near the head of Delaware Bay. Owing to the lack of sufficient data in the Maryland records, the other Indian settlements on Delaware Bay are not here discussed (*Archives*, Vol. XVII, pp. 221, 233, 304).

Our journey through Aboriginal Maryland has now brought us to the Susquehanna river at the headwaters of the Chesapeake bay where lived the warlike Susquehannocks. According to Captain Smith, these Indians numbering "six hundred able and mighty men" like the Tockwoghes lived in "pallizadoed" towns. The colonists estimated that the Susquehannocks could muster "about seven hundred fighting men."³⁶ These estimates would give a total Indian population of between fifteen hundred and two thousand.

Besides the settlement called Sasquehannnough which Smith placed nearest the mouth of the Susquehanna river, on his map are noted the settlements or possibly tribes of Quadroque, Attatock, Cepowig, Utchowig and Tesinigh. With the exception of Cepowig which may have been in the vicinity either of Westminster, Maryland, or of the Bush river in Harford county, all

³⁶ *Smith's Works*, pp. 53, 54, 350; *Archives*, Vol. I, p. 472; *Handbook*, Part II, p. 132. De Fries in February, 1633, while cruising on the Delaware river in the vicinity of Fort Nassau encountered a detachment of Indians who had come overland from the main settlement of Susquehannocks, then boasting of six hundred warriors (*Collection N. Y. Hist. Soc.*, 2 s., III, Part I, pp. 31-32, 1857; *Handbook American Indians*, Part II, p. 655). A *Jesuit Relation of 1647-48* states that in a single village of the Susquehannocks there were at that time thirteen hundred men capable of bearing arms. This would indicate a total population of about four thousand for that village alone. It is not clear from the *Relation* which village of the Susquehannocks is referred to (*Handbook American Indians*, Part II, p. 132).

The Susquehannocks were also known as the Conestoga. By the French the Susquehannocks were known as the Andastoes, by the Dutch and Swedes as the Minquas. The Maryland colonists sometimes referred to the Susquehannocks as the Minquas. (*Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 415, 432, 433; John G. Shea, in *Alsop's Character of the Province of Maryland*, Md. Hist. Fund Pub., Vol. XV, pp. 117-121, 123; Davis, p. 110; *Schoolcraft*, Vol. VI, Chap. I, p. 138; Justin Winsor, *Hist. of Amer.*, Vol. IV, p. 433; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, pp. 336, 337, 620; *ibid.*, Part II, pp. 654, 655, 1133.) The colonists in one instance refer to the Black Mingoos (*Archives*, Vol. XVII, p. 5). This was probably a reference to the Erie Indians (*Herman's Map of 1670*; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, p. 659). For different Colonial spellings of the word Susquehannock see *Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 196, 231, 401, 407.

the other four tribes or settlements noted by Smith were probably within what is now Pennsylvania.³⁷

As to the location of Smith's Sasquehannough village, it was perhaps about forty miles from the mouth of the Susquehanna river and within what was then claimed to be Maryland territory.³⁸ Not only do the Maryland records abound with references to the Susquehanna fort but it must also be borne in mind that the northern boundary of Maryland was long the subject of dispute with Penn and his descendants.³⁹ The Marylanders claimed to the fortieth parallel which runs about five miles south of the present town of Lancaster, Pennsylvania.⁴⁰ On the Herman Map of 1670 the Susquehanna fort is placed on the forty degree boundary line and this seems about correct.⁴¹ Indeed William Penn himself appears to have at one time agreed that the Susquehannock fort should be considered as within Maryland territory.⁴² It was near the old Susquehannock fort that Thomas Cresap who played such an important part in the later border warfare between Pennsylvania and Maryland, established his fort and kept a ferry.⁴³

The chief enemy of the Susquehannocks were the Five Nations or Iroquois to the north of them. After the defeat of the Susquehannocks in 1675 by the Iroquois, the situation changed. It was then that the Susquehannocks driven southward, either along, or combined with their erstwhile enemies the

³⁷ *Works of Smith*, p. 384; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, pp. 654, 655.

³⁸ *Lord Baltimore Map, 1635*; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, pp. 654, 655-57; *ibid.*, Part I, p. 336.

³⁹ *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 150, 417, 418.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of the location of the town of Conestoga built by the Susquehannocks after their defeat by the Iroquois in 1673-77, see William B. Marye, "The Old Indian Road," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, Vol. XV, pp. 370, 371.

⁴¹ *Herman's Map of 1670*. Here the fort is located about forty miles from the mouth of the Susquehanna. In one instance the Maryland colonists wrongly estimate the distance to be "about sixty miles" (*Archives*, Vol. XV, p. 122).

⁴² *Archives*, Vol. V, p. 272.

⁴³ Marye, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, Vol. XV, p. 376.

Iroquois, made attacks on the Maryland colonists and the latter's Indian allies, the Piscattoways, Chopticoes and Mattowoman's. It will be recalled that the Five Nations of whom the Iroquois were composed, included the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Senecas and the Cayugas. To all of these nations the Maryland records contain frequent reference as well as to the Susquehannocks. During the period under discussion the attacks and depredations of these northern Indians on both sides of the Chesapeake were feared, especially on the western shore. The Senecas were particularly active in invading Maryland.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Livingston Farrand, *Basis of Amer. Hist.*, Amer. Nation Series, Vol. II, p. 155. Map opposite this page shows tribal division and territory of Iroquois about 1650. *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, p. 335; *ibid.*, Part II, pp. 654, 655, 1086; Shea, *Md. Hist. Soc. Fund. Pub.*, Vol. XV, pp. 117-121, 123; Bozman, Vol. II, pp. 161, 162; Schoolcraft, Vol. VI, Chap. IV, p. 138; Charles W. Bump, "Indian Place Names in Maryland," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, Vol. II, p. 287. The latter is an article interpreting aboriginal names of rivers and places in Maryland.

Colonial variations of Seneca are Cenockoes, Cynaco, Cinigo, Cinego, Naysone and Sinnowdowannes (*Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 400, 407, 530; *ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 417, 418, 502, 503, 530; *ibid.*, Vol. VIII, p. 181; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 157, 166; *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, pp. 503, 507). Oneida is sometimes Oneydes, Janadoc, Janado, Janedoc or Janedeas (*Archives*, Vol. I, p. 416; *ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 403, 501, 502, 503; *ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 15; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, p. 157). Cayuga is often Aquiaquoes, Quiaquos, or Onjonges (*Archives*, Vol. XV, pp. 157, 375, 382, 383, 418; *ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 258. See also *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, pp. 223, 224; *ibid.*, Part II, pp. 125, 126). The Mohawks were sometimes called the Maques, as already noted (*Archives*, Vol. VII, p. 320; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, p. 157). Smith speaks of the Massawomeke Indians (*Smith's Works*, pp. 350, 422; Bozman, Vol. I, pp. 112, 113, 125, 126, 141, 142). Shea identifies the Massawomekes with the Mohawks (Shea, *Md. Hist. Soc. Fund. Pub.*, Vol. XV, p. 118) but the weight of authority would seem to apply the name to a tribe who dwelt in the mountainous regions of the upper Susquehanna and its branches and who were destroyed by the Mohawks in 1652 (*Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, pp. 657, 658). Henry Fleet, early Virginia trader to Maryland waters, speaks of the Massomacks and of the Mohaks, apparently also distinguishing the two (Edward D. Neill, *The Founders of Maryland*, pp. 20, 25). See also Schoolcraft, Vol. VI, Chap. I, p. 130, and *Handbook of American Indians*, Part II, p. 1087.

Maryland Colonial records mention the Sanhikan Indians (*Archives*, Vol. III, p. 415). These Indians have been identified with the Mohawks

Father White as early as 1636 had suggested that a trading post be established by the Lord Proprietor at Palmer's Island at the mouth of the Susquehanna.⁴⁵ Because the Susquehannocks maintained that the Maryland colonists had aided some of their enemies against them, hostilities soon followed.⁴⁶ By 1652, however, the province had gained an important concession, when these Indians gave up all claim to jurisdiction over the land of the eastern shore between the Choptank and the North-east rivers, excepting the "Ile of Kent and Palmer's Island." By this treaty the colonists as well as the Susquehannocks reserved the right "to build a house or fort for trade" upon Palmer's Island.⁴⁷ After this agreement the relations between the colonists and the Susquehannocks were more friendly, the colonists even going to the extent of helping the Indians to enlarge their fort as a protection against their enemies the Senecas.⁴⁸

At first, due to colony's aid the Susquehannocks were able to resist the encroachments of the Iroquois tribes. When this was withdrawn in 1675, they were defeated and the Iroquois inherited what remained of the Susquehannocks' claims to land at the head of the Chesapeake bay.⁴⁹

Besides their agreement of 1652 with the Susquehannocks already mentioned, the colonists in 1659 entered into an agreement with several eastern shore Indian tribes which gave the English the right "to seat themselves . . . upon any land on

by some (Garriek Mallery, "The Former and Present Number of Our Indians," *Am. Assoc. Advancement of Science, Proceedings for 1877*, p. 352) and by others with the Assumpink Indians, a division of the Delawares who once lived on Stony creek near Trenton (*Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, pp. 105, 922-26; *ibid.*, Part II, pp. 503, 654, 1086, 1087, 1131).

⁴⁵ *Md. Hist. Soc. Fund Pub.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 210, 211 (The Calvert Papers).

⁴⁶ *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 116, 117; *Fund Pub.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 183.

⁴⁷ *Archives*, Vol. III, p. 277; *Bozman*, Vol. II, p. 449. Palmer's Island was later known as Watson's Island (Neill, *Founders*, p. 10).

⁴⁸ *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 417, 418, 421.

⁴⁹ *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, p. 336; *ibid.*, Part II, p. 505.

the Eastern shore belonging to the foresaid Indians.”⁵⁰ As plantations had already been established on the mainland of the eastern shore the previous year, the treaty merely recognized an accomplished fact.⁵¹

While our conclusions will not have the stamp of mathematical accuracy, it is interesting none the less, to make a rough estimate of the Indian population of Maryland during the early part of the seventeenth century.

Contrary to the usual impression, Indians living in the eastern part of what was later the United States, were sedentary rather than nomadic in their habits. The Indians, like the whites who came later, naturally chose favorable locations along rivers and bays. On these rivers and inlets they lived in towns, villages really, generally small with rarely over a few hundred inhabitants. Maryland records contain frequent reference to Indian “towns.” Many of the early English settlers on the eastern seaboard erroneously concluded, however, that because they found a certain number of Indians along river banks and inlets, an equivalent number lived in the interior. This inference was obviously without justification.⁵³

⁵⁰ *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 362, 363.

⁵¹ “Talbot County Rent Rolls,” *Calvert Papers*. Bozman is therefore incorrect when he states that “no settlements of Europeans were made on any part of the Eastern Shore of Maryland until after the year 1660, except on the isle of Kent” (*Bozman*, Vol. I, p. 115).

On the question of the attitude of the early colonists toward the validity of the Indians’ title to land in Maryland, see Charles C. Royce, “Maryland’s Land Policy Towards the Indians,” in the article on “Indian Land Cessions” in the *United States 18th Annual Report (1893-94)*, *Bureau of American Ethnology*, pp. 569.

The colonists refer to the following Indians as living on the mainland of the Eastern Shore. It has, however, been impossible to determine their exact location. Possibly they are inaccurate spellings of Indians already known and located. Such Indians are: The Rasoughteicks, Quowaughkutts, Sequawaughteicks, Motcawaughkins, Quequashkecasquicks, Wachetaks, Maraughquaicks, Manasksons, and Amusteacks (*Archives*, Vol. III, p. 363; *ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 480).

⁵² *Archives*, Vol. III, pp. 118, 147, 148, 191; *ibid.*, Vol. XV, p. 145.

⁵³ Farrand, *Basis of American Hist.*, p. 99; Mallery, *Indian Population*, p. 340.

Another matter that should be kept in mind when we are making our estimate of the Indian population of Maryland is this. How does our result compare with the estimates which have thus far been made of the entire Indian population of North America? A compilation of figures from other sources would indicate an Indian population of less than two hundred thousand during the early seventeenth century. This estimate is applicable to the region east of the Mississippi river and south of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes.⁵⁴

Wentworth Greenhalgh in 1677 estimated the number of Iroquois in and about New York as almost eleven thousand, and Sir William Johnson about a century later, in 1763, gave an estimate of about twelve thousand for the Five Nations.⁵⁵ The Algonquins, south of the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes have been estimated as ninety thousand.⁵⁶ With the exception of the Susquehannocks and the Anacostans, who were both of Iroquois stock, all of the Maryland Indians belonged to the Algonquin family.

It should also be recalled that Dankers and Sluyter when visiting Maryland in 1679-80 remarked that "there are few Indians in comparison with the extent of the country."⁵⁷ Lord Baltimore discussing the Indians in 1678 said that "their strength and numbers are not considerable. Living under several distinct governments, some have two hundred, some three hundred, some five hundred subjects."⁵⁸

In order to obtain an idea of the Indian population of Maryland in the early seventeenth century, we can either use Captain Smith's account or we can refer to colonial sources. Let us first consult Smith. According to Smith we found that on the eastern shore of Maryland there were about three hundred

⁵⁴ George Bancroft, *Hist. of U. S.*, Vol. II, pp. 407, 408 (1876 ed.).

⁵⁵ Mallery, 357.

⁵⁶ Bancroft, Vol. II, p. 407.

⁵⁷ "Dankers and Sluyter Journal, 1679-80," *Memoirs of the Long Island Hist. Soc.*, Vol. I, p. 195.

⁵⁸ *Archives*, Vol. V, p. 265. This would be an average of about three hundred under each government.

Indians living on the Pocomoke river, six hundred on the Nanticoke, one hundred and eighty on the Chester and three hundred on the Sassafras river. This gives a total of between thirteen and fourteen hundred Indians living on these four rivers.

The only colonial estimate that we have for any of the eastern shore rivers is for the Choptank which according to an estimate made in 1640 contained an Indian population of about two hundred. It is true that at one time Claiborne while trading on the eastern shore was surrounded by about four hundred Indians, but this figure cannot be used as the exact location of the Indians in question is not known.⁵⁹

Adding the Indian population of two hundred of the Choptank to the thirteen hundred already noted for Smith's four rivers, we have a total known Indian population of fifteen hundred for five eastern shore rivers, or an average population of about three hundred for each of these rivers. Although we do not know the number, we have had however evidence from colonial sources that Indians were living on the Annemesse, Manokin, Wicomico, Elk and Northeast rivers, and on several of the smaller rivers. As we have no estimate of the Indian population of the last five rivers, we can apply the average of the five rivers of which we do know the population, that is three hundred, to each of the five rivers with an unknown population.⁶⁰ This would give us an additional Indian population of fifteen hundred. As the vicinity of the Elk and Northeast rivers was more subject to depredations from the northern tribes than the other eastern shore rivers, it is perhaps unreasonable to allow three hundred for each of these rivers. If we make allowance for this, we would have an Indian population of between two and three thousand for the eastern shore.

On the Susquehanna, as Captain Smith's estimate of the Indian population was practically confirmed by the Maryland colonists, we can assume an Indian population of between

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 190, 194.

⁶⁰ Compare with Lord Baltimore's estimate of three hundred under each government, *supra*.

fifteen hundred and two thousand for this part of Maryland. This estimate should be considered as applying to land on both sides of the Susquehanna river up to the fortieth parallel in accordance with Maryland's territorial claims. This estimate should also be considered as applying only to the very early period, for as we have noticed, the Susquehannocks were considerably diminished later by wars and disease.⁶¹

In a subsequent article the location and number of the western shore Indians will be considered.

MARSHALL HALL BURYING GROUND AT MARSHALL HALL, MD.

The 18 epitaphs are on large, flat horizontal stones within a rectangular, wooden-fenced enclosure about 100 yards east of the Marshall House, and were copied by Miss Carrie W. Avery on July 22, 1923. The location is on the Potomac River nearly opposite Mt. Vernon.

These epitaphs are as follows; but not arranged in the order of the graves but rather of family relationship:

- 1 Here lies Thomas Marshall, Gentleman, who departed this life on ye 10 day of June in the 65 year of his age. 1759.
- 2 To the memory of Mrs. Elizabeth Marshall wife of Thomas Marshall who died in an advanced age by her son Thomas Hanson Marshall. 1772.
- 3 Here lies Sabina Truman Marshall wife of Thomas Marshall Gentlemen deceased and daughter of Colo Thomas Truman Greenfield and Susannah his wife who departed this life in the 53 year of her age on the 1st of March. Anno Domini 1768.

⁶¹. "Susquehanna Indians . . . reduced to a small number." This was in 1692 (*Archives*, Vol. VIII, p. 518). See also *Handbook of American Indians*, Part I, p. 336; *Hazard's Annals of Pa.*, p. 346; Shea, p. 120.

- 4 The remains of Thomas Hanson Marshall are interred under This stone He was son to Thomas and Elizabeth Marshall, born 9 Apl 1731 and died 8 March 1801 age 70 years wanting one month.
- 5 To the memory of Mrs. Rebecca Marshall daughter to Col George Dent and his wife who departed this life on ye 5 day of December 1770 in the 33 year of, her, age by her loving husband Thomas Hanson Marshall.
- 6 Under this stone is deposited the body of Sarah Dent daughter of Thomas and Elizabeth Marshall who died 9 Apl 1795 age 59 years and 6 months.
- 7 Here lies Dr. Thomas Marshall son of Thomas H. and Rebecca Marshall who departed this life on the 6 day of June. A. D. 1829 age 72 years and 2 months.
- 8 Entomed is the body of Mrs. Ann Marshall who departed this life the 31st day of July 1805 age 27 years. Inscribed to her memory by her affectionate husband Thomas Marshall.
- 9 To the memory of Mrs. Margaret Marshall wife of the late Dr. Thomas Marshall 2 June 1837 74 years old.
- 10 Here lies Mary the wife of Philip Stuart daughter of Thomas Hanson and Rebecca Marshall. born 26 April 1767. married 15 May 1787 and died 8 May 1789 age 22 years and 12 days.
- 11 Here lies George D. Marshall, son of Thomas and Ann Marshall. died 11 Sept 1822 age 28 years 2 months and 2 days
- 12 Here lies Thomas H. Marshall. Son of Thomas and Ann Marshall died 13 day of December 1843 in 47 year. Placed by his wife E. A. H. Marshall.
- 13 To the memory of Eleanor A. H. Marshall consort of Thomas H. Marshall born 6th Dec 1801 died 25 Oct. 1852.
- 14 Here lies Eleanor R. A. Marshall the child of Thomas H. and Eleanor A. Marshall. died 26 Sep 1829 age 6 years 9 mo and 29 days.

- 15 Here lies Margaret Elizabeth Ann daughter of Thomas H. and E. A. Marshall. died 18 Oct. 1833 age 9 years 3 mo—22 days.
- 16 Here lies Mary Catherine daughter of Thos H. and E. A. Marshall died 8 Sep 1833 age 5 years 15 days.
- 17 Here lies Eleanor Douglass daughter of Thomas and E. A. Marshall died 21 Aug 1833 age 3 years 9 mo & 22 days.
- 18 In memory of Mary Marshall died 3 Jan 1827 age about 65 years. by her affectionate niece E. A. Marshall.

NOTES BY HERBERT P. GERALD ON MARSHALL EPITAPHS, AS
NUMBERED.

1. He was born Jan. 31, 1694, in the original and present "Marshall Hall" house, built by his father, William Marshall II, about 1690; and this William Marshall II, who died in 1698, was son of William Marshall I (died 1673), the founder of this branch of the Marshall Family, who came from England to what is now Charles Co., Md., by 1641, and bought this tract of land from the Indians.

The wife of William Marshall II and mother of this Thomas Marshall (1694-1759) was Elizabeth Hanson, daughter of Randolph Hanson; and after the death of W. M. in 1698 she married, second, Col. John Fendall, son of Josiah Fendall.

At the death of W. M. II (1698) his son, T. M. (1694-1759) fell heir to "Marshall Hall"; and the estate (which at one time included 4000 acres) descended from father to son, to four other Thomas Marshalls until 1866, when it was sold out of the family by Thomas Marshall (1826-1903), who is buried in Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown. At this sale the family burying-ground was reserved to the Marshall family. There is no known connection between these Maryland Marshalls and the Virginia Marshalls (of Chief Justice Marshall's line).

2. She was Mrs. Elizabeth Batie Stoddert, widow of Capt. James Stoddert, when she married Thomas Marshall in 1726 or 27. She died about 1755, and her husband married, second, Miss Sabina Truman Greenfield on Aug. 3, 1756?
3. She was second wife of Thomas Marshall. Perhaps her first name was Sabina. Miss Lowther says so in her "Marshall Hall" pamphlet, page 18; and says that it is "Sabina" in the old Marshall Hall Bible.
4. He was an intimate friend of George Washington; and at one time offered to buy Mt. Vernon from him, while Washington offered to buy Marshall Hall. Neither would sell. Their brief correspondence on this point was as follows:

"Dear Marshall:
Is Marshall Hall for sale? If so, how much?
George Washington."

"Dear General:
Marshall Hall is not for sale. But if you wish to sell Mount Vernon, fix your price, and it is mine.
Thomas H. Marshall."
5. She was married in 1756. Her father was Chief Justice of Maryland.
6. In 1752 she married John Dent, who was later a General in the Revolution.
7. He was a surgeon in the Revolution, and lost his eyesight in this service.
8. She was Miss Ann Claggett, daughter of Richard and Mary Claggett, and first wife of Dr. T. M., whom she married October 29, 1795.
9. Her maiden name was Margaret Marshall, cousin of Dr. T. M., whom she married in 1808 as his second wife.
10. Philip Stuart, of Virginia, was a general in the Revolution.

12. He was Thomas Hanson Marshall II (?1796-1845?) and he married Miss Eleanor Ann Helen Hardesty in 1821.
 18. At present I do not know her relationship in the family.
- H. P. G.
-

“FORT FREDERICK”: ITS OWNERSHIP, AND HOW TITLE WAS TWICE ACQUIRED BY MARYLAND.*

BY W. McCULLOH BROWN

From the earliest Colonial times it has been the custom in Maryland to assign a name to every tract of land for which a patent or title was given.

The land acquired at the time of the building of Fort Frederick was made up from parts of two tracts, the first was named “Skie Thorn” having been granted to Captain Thomas Cresap, pioneer, guide and Indian fighter (Patented to him June 16, 1739, Liber E. I. No. 6 folio 155, Recorded in Annapolis), and the second was a part of “Johnson’s Lot” granted to Peter Johnson (Surveyed in 1743 and Patented April 7, 1745. Recorded at Annapolis in Liber L. G. No. E, folio 581).

After General Braddock’s defeat in 1755, Governor Horatio Sharp and the Colonial Legislature decided that the frontier and the outlying settlements not far from the Conococheague River must be protected from the French and Indian raids, so it was agreed to build a stone fort at the North Mountain.

The Governor on behalf of the Colony, purchased 149 acres of land from Peter and Jacob Cloine as described above, paying for the same one hundred and twenty-five pounds. (Deed dated

* Address made at Fort Frederick, April 27, 1929, before a gathering of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in celebration of extensive Tree Planting upon the State Reserve.

August 19, 1756, and recorded in Liber F. folio 25 in Frederick County, Maryland.)

The Governor states that by the end of August (1756) the Fort was "well advanced, so that the garrison was well covered."

At the close of the French and Indian war, Governor Sharp leased the land and fort to Henry Heingman at an annual rental of thirty pounds (Lease December 25, 1762) and so it rested until the State Government of Maryland was formed (February 10, 1777) and Thomas Johnson elected as the first Governor.

After the close of the Revolutionary War the State officials saw no further use for the land or Fort, so it was offered at public sale on September 5, 1791, and was purchased by Robert Johnson of Frederick County, for the sum of three hundred and seventy-five pounds. In the deed which was not executed by Alexander Contee Hanson, Chancellor, until May 25, 1797, the acreage is given as 99½ acres. (Recorded in Liber K. folio 522, Washington County, Maryland.)

Thus after ownership of 35 years by Maryland the Fort and land passed into other and private hands, where it was to remain for 131 years.

After many vicissitudes, and many transfers the title to Fort and land came into possession of a negro named Nathan Williams shortly prior to the Civil War (Recorded Liber I. N. 15 folio 210, Washington County), the deed being dated August 30, 1860.

The desecration of the old landmark must largely be laid at the door of Williams. It was he who tore down one bastion and built a barn on its foundation, while other gaps were made in the walls. The Fort was in possession of the Williams family for 51 years.

The unnecessary and wanton destruction of the old structure, in time aroused public sentiment to preserve it, and once more bring it under state ownership. On March 22, 1892, Senator David Siebert of Washington County, introduced a

Bill in the Maryland Legislature directing the Attorney General to report to the Governor "What title the State of Maryland has in the property in Washington County, Maryland, known as 'Fort Frederick.'" Supposedly looking to the recovery of the Fort property by the State for its preservations and use as a permanent camp site for the militia. (Chapter 552, Acts of 1892.)

For twelve years the matter rested, and no official action was taken in relation to the Fort. At the session of the Legislature in 1904, however, Joint Resolution No. 7 was passed; by it a Committee was named, consisting of Governor Edwin Warfield, Thomas L. Patterson, Alexander Armstrong, Jr., and Miss Leonore Hamilton. They were asked to prepare an accurate plan of Fort Frederick and to obtain the cost of rebuilding, etc. Miss Hamilton wrote and had published a valuable pamphlet on the Fort, and containing fine illustrations and photographs.

This report increased the public knowledge and interest in the old structure, but did not then result in securing an appropriation for its acquisition by the State.

The next move was the passage of Chapter 473 $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Acts of 1906, entitled, An Act to incorporate the Fort Frederick Protective Society. The incorporators were: Edwin Warfield, Miss Leonore Hamilton, Ferdinand Williams, Douglas Thomas, Wm. J. Witzenbacher, Robert R. Henderson, James Shriver and Alexander Armstrong, Jr. and their successors. The corporation was given power "To acquire by gift, devise, lease, purchase, or condemnation the land in Washington County, Maryland, upon which the stone structure known as "Fort Frederick" now stands, and such lands adjacent thereto, as may be necessary and proper to protect, preserve, repair, and restore said stone structure, and provide access thereto for the public, etc." No appropriation was asked for from the State.

By Act of the Legislature of Maryland of 1906, Chapter 294, approved April 15, 1906, "The Maryland State Board of Forestry" had been established, and gifts of land made to

the State as Forest Reserves, and for recreation uses. So the State had a body ready to care for and administer State Forests and Parks, with a trained forester in charge.

The Fort Property had been in the possession of the Nathan Williams family for 51 years when the older man having died his heirs got into financial difficulties, and the Fort Property was put up at foreclosure sale, and was bought by Homer J. Cavanaugh of Washington County, for the sum of \$7,864.25. The deed bearing date of January 3, 1911. (Recorded in Liber E. O. No. 135, folio 48, of the Land Records of Washington County, Maryland.) The acreage being given as 189½ acres.

In addition to the gentlemen named in the "Fort Frederick Protective Society," the late Judge Henry Stockbridge, and Dr. William Bullock Clark, executive officer of the State Board of Forestry, became actively interested to secure the Fort for the State, through an appropriation made by the Legislature. The result was that Senator Samuel Emmert of Washington County, introduced a bill in 1912, "Authorizing the State Board of Forestry to acquire for and in the name of the State, a tract in Washington County, Maryland, on which is situate Old Fort Frederick, together with such other additional land adjacent thereto as may in the judgment of the board be necessary and expedient, etc.," and appropriating the sum of \$8,500. to the State Board of Forestry for the acquisition of the property. (Chapter 794, Acts of 1912. Approved April 15, 1912.)

This Act together with its appropriation, made a definite and concrete proposition for the acquisition of the old Fort, and the Forestry Board was ready and anxious to carry out the purpose of the Act.

It was unfortunate that the appropriation could not have been made before the foreclosure sale of the Williams heirs, for though Cavanaugh had purchased the property but little over a year before, he promptly refused an offer of \$8,500. cash, and jumped the value at one time as high as \$17,000.

There began a long and tedious intermittent negotiation which lasted for over ten years. Dr. William Bullock Clark, the executive officer of the Forestry Board, placed our appropriation upon compound interest, so that at the end of the ten years it had materially increased and assisted in the purchase.

When in 1914, on January 30th, Cavanaugh had definitely refused an offer of \$8,500. cash for the whole farm, attempts were made to effect a trade in farms, and four equally good or better farms were suggested to him for purchase within our appropriation.

Cavanaugh offered at one time to sell the Fort and 15 acres of land adjacent to it for \$8,500. but as this would not have allowed forest planting, or have given access to the attractive Potomac River frontage the Board would not consider it.

Finally the owner realized that the State would not meet his figure, and that there were other more desirable farms which could be had, so in October 1922 we opened compromise negotiations on a basis of a purchase price of \$12,000. for the Fort and 189½ acres of land. The deed to the State of Maryland was to be executed by Homer J. Cavanaugh and Nora V. Cavanaugh, his wife, and delivered on December 30, 1922, and at the same time the Board of Forestry was to execute a lease to Cavanaugh for the land and farm buildings, retaining to the State the use and free access to the Fort, the lease to run from January 1, 1923 to April 1, 1924, Cavanaugh to have the right to sow and harvest two crops of wheat or grass, and at the termination of the lease on April 1, 1924, to take down and remove the barn standing upon the one bastion, and carry away the lumber provided it was removed before the first day of May. On this basis the lease was signed by W. McCulloch Brown, as representing the State Board of Forestry, and the deed to the State signed and executed on December 30, 1922. (Recorded in Liber 164, folio 183, one of the Land Records of Washington County, Maryland.)

So after the lapse of 131 years the Old Fort, and 189 1/2 acres of adjoining land came into the possession of our State.

This was the last official act of the State Board of Forestry as originally organized, for under the reorganization plan of Governor Ritchie, which went into effect on January 1, 1923, the Board ceased to exist as formerly, and the Forest Department, and the State Forester were placed under the Regents of the University of Maryland.

EXTRACTS FROM ACCOUNT AND LETTER BOOKS OF
DR. CHARLES CARROLL, OF ANNAPOLIS.

Annapolis Jan^{ry} 28th 1750

Sir

I hope you have provided me pork for the Goods and money delivered you if not it will be a Manifest Loss haveing very pressing call for it for my People.

I have prevailed on the bearer Mr Thomas Williamson to call on you to know what has been done or when I may Expect the Pork and what Quantety.

Your favour and care in this matter will greatly Oblige.
To Mr Hen^{ry} Travers in Dorchester County

Mr Tho^s Williamson

I Leave the Inclosed for Mr Travers Open for your peruseal that by his Answer you may conduct your Self.

In case Mr Travers has not got for me Six Thousand weight of Nett Pork at least and you find he will asuredly Send it to me soon I desire you will Buy for me at the Cheapest rate you can Thirty Barrells of Pork to weigh according to the Act provided Two Hundred and Ten or Twenty to be paid for in

Sterling delivered here in Annapolis to me, or if not here at Snow Hill or else where on Navigable Water where I may on Sending for be sure thereof.

Your care will be of Singular Service.

To Mr Tho^s Williamson Jan^{ry} 28th 1750

Gentlemen

I have sent you a Clause which You may alter If you do not approve & let me see the Alteration & let me have a Draft of such Bond as you desire & I will (if I Can Safely) sign it for I desire to do every Thing that may please you so as not to make my Title in a Worse Condition than it was, Had I thought that the matter would have proved as it has, I never had taken the Expedient I did.

I suppose you Intend I should make the 150 Ton and you are sensible accidents has & may happen in such Case but Suppose it should be Ten Tun more you would not take Advantage.

My Intention is to Get a Stock just as near to the 150 Tun as may be & if it proves less I shall be Content but if it may make a little more it would be hard to throw it by & therefore if you Judge reasonable to have that Point Explained so as I may not Risque my Articles or Bond.

28th Jan^{ry} 1750

To Daniel Dulany Esq^r & Co^y

Annapolis 26th Febr^{ry} 1750

S^r

As I would Gladly promote the Bar Iron Business and Could dispose of more than my proportion of What we make I will take Ten or Twenty Ton yearly of your Company at a Moderate Rate in Sterling to be accounted for yearly, and in order to make Beginning I will for the present Take Ten Ton at fifteen

pounds Sterling £ Ton which I Conceive will afford me no more than Common Comicon for the Sale and Risk.

If you accept of this Offer I desire you will order five Ton to be drawn directly accordg to the Inclosed Memdⁿ and let it be put on Board a Vessel of Mr Patrick Creagh which is going up to Charles Town and shall direct him to take it in for me.

The other five Ton may be of the Same Sort with an addicon of one Ton of ploughshare molds and sent on to Annapolis £ Dunne or some other of your Skippers as soon as Convenient you Can your answer will oblige.

Mend^o Of five Ton Barr Iron for Dr Ch: Carroll of Annapolis

One Ton of Inch Square Barr Iron

Half Ton $7/8^{\text{ths}}$ of an Inch Square

Half Ton $3/4$ of an Inch Square

Half Ton Inch & Quarter Square

Half Ton of plow Share Molds

One Ton of Suitable Tire Iron fit for shooin Waggons

Half Ton of Slender Flatt, fit for Slitting into Spike Iron

Half a Ton Large Flatt Iron

To Mr Nathaniel Chapman at the Kingsberry Furnace in
Baltimore County These

Annapolis March 1st 1750

Sr

By Mr Patrick Creagh the Bearer hereof I send you my Bills for fifty pounds, In lieu of which I desire you will send me thirty pounds Sterling part of the said Bills in the Current Bills of Credit of this province at Seventy five £ Cent Exchange for Under that I will not let them Go which will make fifty Two pounds Ten Shillings this Currency and no Gold or Silver will answer the Remaining Twenty pounds of the fifty I shall leave in your Hands and take in Your Currency for which I Expect the highest Exchange Current which I shall be Glad to know by Mr Creagh.

I shall draw an order on you for Your Currency when I want and advise you thereof Accordingly.

Pray fail not in sending me the fifty Two pounds Ten shill this Currency by Mr Creagh and take his Recet for the same.

P. S. If you keep the Bills as I doubt not but you will Pray send the Two Inclosed Letters by the first Ship for London. And let me know the Ship and Masters name you send them by I must also request you will Recommend them to such Masters Care as your Own Letters which will add to your favours.

Returned the Bills as money not to be had there
Mr Reese Meredith

1st month 1750

Maryland March 1st 1750

Sir

On this date I have drawn on you at Sixty days sight for fifty pounds Sterling payable to Mr Reese Meredith of Philadelphia which I desire you will at Time pay and Charge to my Account.

By Judd or perhaps sooner shall transmit you Bill to leave Ball: in Your Hands by way of Philadelphia have transmitted you Bill, to be Reced by you for my use £119:10s: which I hope will Come Safe.

To Mr Will. Black Merchant in London

Ⓟ the Nancy

Copy Ⓟ Way

Lloyd's Ship

Bristol

Annapolis 4th March 1750

Sir

I will take three Thousand Feet of Inch pine planck or what, Murphy the Bearer can bring at a Turn not to Exceed that quantity at Eight Shil & four pence Ⓟ Hundred provided you

will take it in Goods w^{ch} you have at the Rates Anexed to them and will send him Over in Eight or Ten days with your son and by your son send the forty pounds Currency I let you have as allso what cash you Sold any of the Goods for.

I do this to Save my self the Charge of Sending a Messenger for the money w^{ch} I realy want, and desire you will send me Accordingly.

The Rest of the Good's I would have you keep and Sell for me at the Rates Anexed to them for money upon which I will allow you comission as useual.

As I conceive your Son a Safe hand chuse this method.
To Mr Hen^y Travers

March 10th 1750

Sir

I have Considered Mr Dulany's opinion, a Copy of which I inclose you, nor do I Conceive that thereby I am obliged to render you such an Account as you require or pay such Interest. I am and have been always ready to make up an Acc^t of Mr Ja^s Carroll's Estate agreeable to the Laws of the Country, with the Commissary Generall and you are sensible that the Legacys are all paid & the Estate Considerably overpaid, the account I gave you Contains all that ever I reced of that Estate & if you or any other Can shew that I reced six pence more I will pay it and this is as faithfull a discharge of that Trust as Can be by any reasonable man required.

As to What the Vestry did in Consequence of their Duty without (I am sure) any Thought of you, I dare say the others despise your Resentments as much as I do.

I neither pin my Credit or Faith on Your Good or ill opinion which I look on as Trifling and I am but too well assured you will do all the Injury in your power to S^r

Y^r most h^{ble} Serv^t
C. C.

To Charles Carroll Esq^r

March 12th 1750S^r

I had the favour of yours and as you have seen mine to your Relacon M^r Carroll I do not know how I Can add thereto my willingness to do every Thing Incumbent on me as one of the Trustees of M^r James Carrolls will.

I must presume that you are Jointly with M^r Antho: Carroll appointed by that Gent Exe^{tr} and as such in Concurrance with the other Trustees I am ready to Conform to every Thing I ought to do.

I am ready & willing to wait on M^r Charles Carroll and you to the Commissary Generall this morning and make up a final Acc^t of that Estate so far as fell under my Cognizance, and when that is done to give up to you any duly Authorized to Receive them, such Bonds & papers as relate to the Outstanding Debts Consisting of proffit made upon that Estate, for you will please to know that the principal Estate is overpaid by the Trustees, and that what Remains now is what has arisen by the Diligence of the Trustees or such of them as Acted, But Sir, you will please to Consider that I am not to warrant these Debts, but however I will do every ffriendly Act in my power to Assist.

If you wrote to M^r Charles Carroll from Europe he kept such to himself for I never heard a Line from you Untill your Arrival here M^r Anthony Carroll as Devizee to his uncle wrote to have a Legacy paid him which has been Accordingly done. Indeed over done.

I think I need not Enlarge but to assure you that I am ready to do my Duty and that without any Compulsion, but if I am needlessly attacked It is but natural to defend myself as well as I Can. I am with much Respect Sir

Your most h^{ble} Serv^t

C. C.

To M^r James Carroll

These

Potapscó March 23^d 1750

Sir

Inclos'd are two following Special Warrants Viz. one to Resurvey Choats Delight and Elisabeth Fancey dated 20th Inst the other to Effect a Tract of Land called Welsh's Addition dated 14th Jan^{ry} last for the Returns of w^{ch} I will soon prepare.

To

M^r Skipwith Rigbie
Surveyor of Baltimore C^{ty}
or M^r Nich^s Gay

Copy

Original Sent p James Franklin

Maryland March 23^d 1750

Sir

I have wrote to M^r Coddington Carrington Mer^t at Barbados to Ship me Rum & Sugar Value Fifty pounds Ster, And to draw on you for the Same at forty days Sight In case the said Carrinton shall draw on you for the said Sum of Fifty pounds Ster at forty days Sight I desire you will pay the Same and charge it to Acc^{tt}

To Will^m Black Mer^t Copia via Bristol in London

Maryland March 23^d 1750

Sir

Inclosed is Letter of advice to M^r W^m Black w^{ch} contents you will observe and act accordingly Sealing the same & Sending it by some Vessell to London. If you draw for the money I desire you will by the Ship Phillip & James Cap^t Walters send me four Hogsheads of Good Rum not too Low but good Strong

Spirit and well Tasted as I want it for my own use and the Remainder of the money in Good Muscavado Sugar.

4

Please to Mark it C and take Bill of Ladeing at three pounds
 XX
 Ster pr Ton four Hogsheads and Twelve Barrells to the Ton
 to be deliver'd me at Annapolis in Maryland.

Your care and favour herein will Oblige.
 To Coddington Carrington merc^t at Barbados by the Phillip
 & James Cap^t Walters

Annapolis 20th April 1751

Sir

I Expected to have seen you before you went out Town.

Inclosed is Common Warrant for Three Hundred Acres Land by Virtue of w^{ch} I desire you will return the Inclosed Certificate 125 acres called Goswicks Frolick, the Remainder shall make use of at proper time.

To M^r Nich^o Ruxton Gay

⌘

N B the Warant is dated April 16th 1751 Runs to Oct^o 16
 Inclosed to Ri: Croxall

Annapolis May 1st 1751

Sir

Inclosed is a Certificate w^{ch} I desire you will return by Virtue of my Common Warrant Thousand Acres Last given you here.

I gave you the Courses of a Tract of Land called Chance Medley And I am by the Person for whom it is desired to know of you if any late Survey made before it on Toms Creek to the Northward of a Tract of Land called Digges Lott taken up by John Diggs least it may in any way interfere therewith you

are Sensible that poor People should be Cautious. pray let me have a line in Relation hereto.

To Mr Isaac Brook Surveyor of Frederick Cty at Mr Sam Bells near Bladensburg

Annapolis June 11th 1751

Sir

I sent you a Certificate to be returned called Chance Medley 100 Acres The person being apprehensive that that land is not cleere desired me to stop your return of it w^{ch} I request you will untill I see you.

Inclosed is a warrant of 700 Acres of Land by virtue of w^{ch} I desire you will return the Inclosed Certificate of the Adventure Hassard & addition to Bear Meadow I propose Endorsing one hundred Acres of this Warrant to Uncle Uncles w^{ch} assignment I shall send him.

It will much oblige me if you will Return these three Certificates Inclosed of Hassard Addventure & their Bottom soon, the others may be done at your Leisure. It will be of Service to me, for without a patent I can not sell them to advantage, as the purchasers desire it.

Pray send me John Lemons Warr^{tt} 36 acres as allso Jacob Bankers Warrant 100 Acres to have them renew'd.

As I have my Last thousand acres of Common Warrant Located partly on piney Creek I desire you will Reserve 150 Acres thereof particularly for Courses I shall return you as addition to the Land called the Pines on that Creek.

I desire you will Return the Certificate Inclosed of Shires Bottom 130 Acres by Virtue of that Warrant of a Thousand acres last given you 21st April & I think dated 16th of that month.

I desire you will Return my Certificate of the land Called Carlenton 200 Acres by virtue of the Inclosed Warrant of 700

Acres Instead of Returning it by virtue of the thousand acres Warrant.

	Acres
Sheres Bottom	130
Addition to bear	
Meadow	50
Adventure	150
Hassard	200

To Mr Isaac Brook Surveyor of Frederick County at Mr Sam^l
Bells near Bladensburgh & James Chalmers

June 15th 1751

Sir

As I would by no means have any mistake Subsist with a Gentleman with whom I desire much to keep a good and Friendly Corrispondence I therefore hope you are before this time Satisfied that what you ware Informed; and Aledged in your Letter I had said, is Groundless Viz. that you told me I could not Safely pay any money to some Person claiming under James Carroll's will. I now Say that whoever did tell you that I said any such thing told a Palpable Falsety for I never did either in Private or Publick Say any such thing.

As to the letter I wrote you in relation to that affair I thought I had fully Explained the Intention of the Substance therefore to you, And tho I did not keep a Coppy of it I am certain it contained nothing that could be Justly Execepted to, if you Judge it does I shall be much Obligated to you for a Coppy thereof as I am very Inclunable to sett you farther Right in that or any other mistake w^{ch} might casualy Subsist with you.

I gave you an Obligation of Jacob Neiffs w^{ch} you said you thought you would pay I shall take it kindly to know if you will pay that debt or otherwise Send me the obligation that I may endeavour to get it.

I am with much Respect S^r
To Dan^l Dulany Esq^r

Annapolis June 24th 1751

Sir

Inclosed is a Certificate of Courses to be Returned on My Special Warrant for Elisabeths Fancy & Choats Delight I have had it as perfect as I could so as to give you Little Trouble. I have sent you allso the Courses of Welsh's Adventure from the Original Certificate and desire you will Return it Accordingly they tell me in the Office it's the usual method in such cases to Return Exactly by Expressions and Courses.

In case you Judge it Needfull to have the Warrants Renewed Again you may send them by the bearer And I will have them done I mean the Two Spec^l Warrants w^{ch} I think Runs to the 14th of next Month I hope you will do for me so as I meet no disapointment,

To Mr N. R. Gay

Annapolis July 4th 1751

Sir

Inclosed are the Courses for Lemons Range w^{ch} before you said were wrong I hope they will now answer, you will please to Return them of the former date with the Certificate you first had thereof.

I shall be much obliged if you will Return the Certificate of Resurvey upon Catt Tail Marsh called High Germany for the time will Relapse unless soon done. C. C.

To Mr Isaac Brook at

Mr Sam^l Bells near Bladensburgh

p^r W^m Chalmers

Annapolis Maryland July 15th 1751

S^r

On the 13th Instant I Rec^d the favour of yours dated 29th of April last in w^{ch} you refer to a Letter advising that you had sold my Pigg Iron to be delivered at Bewdley at Six pounds Twelve shil & Six pence p^r Ton which Letter I never Received and should have been better pleased you had sold in London at a price certain than Risk that Navigation, but hope it will cleere no less by your Method than that of others the Insurence to

Bristol Landing & Reshiping and other freights will I fear Eat deep however shall suspend my opinion.

I hope that Comodity will raise in the Price or our Mother Country will Ruin her Children in the Plantations nor suffer them to Live, & as things apear at present you your Self are in a way of haveing an Off Spring here.

The Melancholy Loss of our late Lord Proprietary can onely be made up in the son of such a Father. I have a great Regard for your Interest & shall gladly serve you.

As I have not yet Rec^d the Goods I can say Little as to price or Qualety they are in names allmost the same I sent for but I do not aprove of your charge of Insurence as I did not write for any and your Ship been lost I could not Insist on a Recovery of such therefore Expect that Article to be Credited.

I observe in the Trde now, when the Merchants send goods in their own ships they do not charge freight w^{ch} you do in Cap^t Powers whose Ship I understand is your own I hope in this you will use me kindly.

The same Pigg Iron with that Shiped you cleered me in Bristol last year five pound Two Shil & Six pence p^r Ton & in London five pounds I refer further to my next & am with best Respect.

To M^r Cha^s Carman Merc^t
in London

p^r Cap^t Alden

Maryland July 15th 1751

Sir

I Rec^d yours dated 10th Febr^y last with the Goods by Cap^t Hall as allso Acc^{ts} Current w^{ch} so far I find Right.

I have been upon an affair of Building a Furnace and taking up some Land's which Required some payments in Sterling obliged my drawing Bills on you and realy I find it difficult to get in my own Debts here to make as Speedy Remittance as I would chuse to do but in case you are in Advance for me at Any time I shall freely allow you five p^r Cent Interest for the same Yearly untill replaced and as you will be very Secure I believe it is as good as you can make or more in your Publick Funds

now Intrest Lower'd And in this Trade I believe few have made much by Shiping Since our Tobacco Law took place, As I have Interest for my outstanding Debts I shall not think much to allow you the same if in advance for me therefore hope I shall be safe in advancing as I shall allways such advance shall not be much more then Effects in hand or to Permit.

I have Since my last drawn on you the following Bills Amounting to Eighty Two pounds four Shil & four pence Ster which I desire you will pay as they come to hand According to time & Custom and the same Accordingly charge to my Acct^t

Viz—May 23 ^d To Capt Tho ^s Spencer	£ 23.. —.. —
June 12 th To William Young	13.. 10.. 7
June 27 To Caleb Dorsey	43.. 15.. 6
July 6 To John Darnal	1.. 18.. 3
	<hr/>
	£ 82.. 4.. 4

I hope I need not enlarge on this head or doubt of your paying these and any other Bills nor your Advancing for me if Needfull Since you are Sensible that your Security is as good as any you can have there for what I may want.

To

Mr W^m Black Merc^t in London p^r Cap^t Alden Copy P Alleyne
(*To be Continued.*)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY.

April 8, 1929. The regular meeting of the Society was held this night, with the President in the chair.

The minutes of the March meeting were read and approved.

The Secretary read a list of donations to the Gallery and Library. Mr. Dielman added to this list a catalogue of portraits which enable many pictures whose artists were unknown to be identified. This catalogue was the gift of Mrs. Richard H. Pleasants, through Dr. J. Hall Pleasants. It was moved, seconded and carried, that the thanks of the Society be extended to Mrs. Pleasants for this gift.

The following persons, having been previously nominated, were elected to membership:

Active:—

Enoch Harlan
Worthington Hollyday

T. Russell Hicks
Prof. William D. Howell

Associate:—

Mrs. E. Catesby Jones
Mrs. Boyd Wees

Mrs. Warren T. Akers
Mr. Reuben T. Peabody

The President reported that permission had been given to the Baltimore Equitable Society to have photographs or photostats made of some of our collection of Baltimore and Maryland prints, for an exhibition planned by the Company.

The death of Mrs. John Ridgely (Helen West Stewart) an Active Member of this Society, was reported.

It was stated that the sum of \$5,000 had been given to the Society for the beautification and restoration of Old St. Paul's Graveyard in Baltimore City. This donation, given anonymously, is to be used only for the yard and not for the restoration of any graves, vaults, monuments or tombstones. An architect, selected by the Donor, is making plans and a Joint Committee of this Society and of the Vestry of St. Paul's has been appointed. The Council has expressed its appreciation to the Donor and the work will be carried on by the Society.

Before introducing the speaker of the evening, Mr. R. T. Haines Halsey, the President apologized to him for the error made in the title of his address, which should have read: "Our Own Styles in Architecture and Furniture." Mr. Halsey then gave his address, which was accompanied by lantern slides, at the close of which it was unanimously

RESOLVED, That the thanks of the Society be extended to Mr. Halsey for his interesting, instructive and all too short paper.

There being no further business, upon motion duly seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned.